DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 780 EA 004 440

AUTHOR	Knezevich, Stephen J., Ed.
TITLE	Preparation for the American School Superintendency.
INSTITUTION	National Education Association, Washington, D. C. Commission on the Preparation of Professional School Administrators.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	93p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of School Administrators, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00, quantity discounts)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Background; *Administrator Education; Administrator Qualifications; Educational Research; Graduate Students; Graduate Surveys; *Inservice Education; *National Surveys; *Professional Training; *Superintendents

ABSTRACT

This study of administrator preparation covering the period 1969-70 builds on previous AASA-sponsored studies (1962-63). Data were gathered from questionnaires completed and returned by 250 of the 288 institutions surveyed. The report provides information on (1) the history of administrator preparation studies, (2) institutions with graduate preparation programs for the school superintendency, (3) preservice and inservice programs, (4) graduate programs, (5) graduate enrollments, and (6) the faculty. Numerous tables illustrate the findings. (Author/JF)

ED 064780

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Preparation for the American School Superintendency

The AASA
Commission on the
Preparation of Professional
School Administrators

EA 004 440

Copyright 1972
American Association
of School Administrators

Library of Congress
Catalog Card Number: 72-80199

All rights reserved. No part of this
document may be reproduced in any form
without permission in writing from
the publisher.

Single copy, $5
2-9 copies, 10 percent discount
10 or more copies, 20 percent discount

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL **BY MICROFICHE ONLY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASA

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Edited by
Stephen J. Knezevich
Professor of
Educational Administration
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Published by
the American
Association of School
Administrators

Prepared by
the AASA
Commission on the
Preparation of
Professional
School Administrators

The AASA Commission
on the Preparation
of Professional
School Administrators

AASA

Dr. Robert L. Chisholm
Division Superintendent
Arlington County Schools
Arlington, Virginia

Dr. Luvern L. Cunningham
Dean, College of Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Dr. Robert D. Gilberts
Dean, College of Education
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Dr. Russell T. Gregg
Professor of Educational Administration
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Dr. James A. Sensenbaugh
State Superintendent of Schools
Maryland State Department of Education
Baltimore, Maryland

Dr. Thomas T. Tucker, Jr.
Chairman, Department of School Administration and Supervision
College of Education
University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada

Dr. E. L. Whigham
Superintendent
Dade County Schools
Miami, Florida

Dr. Donald J. Willower
Professor of Education
Division of Education Policy Studies
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Dr. S. J. Knezevich, *editor and chairman*
Professor of Educational Administration
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Officers and Staff
1972-73

President
Paul A. Miller, Education Program Specialist, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Vice-President
Norman B. Scharer, Superintendent of Schools, Santa Barbara, California

President-Elect
William L. Austin, Superintendent of Schools, Muskegon, Michigan

Past-President
John B. Geissinger, Superintendent of Schools, Tenafly, New Jersey

Executive Committee
Albert L. Ayars, Superintendent of Schools, Spokane, Washington

Floyd W. Parsons, Superintendent of Schools, Little Rock, Arkansas

H. Vaughn Phelps, Superintendent, Westside Community Schools, Omaha, Nebraska

A. Craig Phillips, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina

Carroll W. Biggs, Superintendent, Alfred I. duPont School District, Wilmington, Delaware

Frank Dick, Superintendent of Schools, Toledo, Ohio

Executive Secretary
Paul B. Salmon, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Secretaries Emeriti
Forrest E. Conner, 1400 20th Street, N.W., Apartment 502, Washington, D.C. 20036

Finis E. Engleman, 115 South Fernwood Avenue, Pitman, New Jersey 08071

Deputy Executive Secretary
William J. Ellena, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Associate Secretaries
Robert M. Isenberg, James R. Kirkpatrick, George B. Redfern, John G. Stuart, Grant Venn, John Wilcox, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Director, AASA-NASE
Grant Venn, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Associate Director, AASA-NASE
Richard G. Morrow, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Consultant, AASA-NASE
William H. Curtis, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Foreword

It is in graduate school that one receives the initial formal preparation designed specifically for administration in the public schools. Considering the ferment in the past 10 years it is time we found out just what school superintendents are studying. What kinds of preparation programs are there in the colleges and universities at the present time? One would expect rather widespread use of newer methods of teaching. One would also expect to find greater emphasis on research. One would expect that preparation programs would bear a close relationship to the real world.

In reviewing programs common a decade ago, one is reminded of Whitehead's discussion of the learned world.

> "First-hand knowledge is the ultimate basis of intellectual life. To a large extent book learning conveys second-hand information, and as such can never rise to the importance of immediate practice. . . . What the learned world tends to offer is one second-hand scrap of information illustrating ideas derived from another second-hand scrap of information. The second-handedness of the learned world is the secret of its mediocrity. It is tame because it has never been scared by facts."

Do current programs suggest that they have indeed been scared by facts? Or is Whitehead's indictment equally applicable today? To determine the answer it is necessary to examine extant programs to see if our expectations have been met.

The real purpose of this study is to gain information upon which to base improvements. It provides an invaluable benchmark so that in future years we can look back and note the progress made.

This study was sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators and prepared by the AASA Commission on the Preparation of Professional School Administrators. The Commission designed the questionnaire, gathered data based on practices during the 1969-70 school year, outlined procedures to be employed for electronic data processing of returns, made the necessary data interpretations, and prepared this special report on preparation programs for the superintendency. It is one of two reports released by the AASA Commission.

Preparation for the American School Superintendency is the result of the cooperative efforts of hundreds of people. While the American Association of School Administrators assumes full responsibility for any errors of fact or interpretation in this report, it gratefully thanks the many people who gave so generously of their time and energy in its preparation.

Paul B. Salmon
Executive Secretary

Contents

11 Highlights of the Study
15 Precedents and Procedures
18 Institutions with Graduate Preparation Programs for the School Superintendency
24 Preservice and Inservice Programs for the Superintendency
37 Graduate Programs: Academic and Financial Dimensions
50 Graduate Enrollments and Student Characteristics
60 The Faculty
77 Appendices

Tables

Table Page

1. Number of Colleges and Universities Reporting, 1962-63 and 1969-70 ... 18
2. Type of Institutional Control for Institutions Responding, 1969-70 18
3. Highest Degree Offered in Preparation Programs for School Superintendency ... 19
4. Highest Degree Offered in Preparation Programs for Administrative Positions Other than Superintendency ... 20
5. Location of Institutions with Graduate Programs in School Administration 20
6. Accreditation of Institutions with Graduate Programs in School Administration ... 21
7. Total Enrollments in Institutions with Superintendency Preparation Programs 22
8. Graduate School Enrollments in Institutions with Superintendency Preparation Programs ... 23
9. School of Education Enrollments in Institutions with Superintendency Preparation Programs ... 23
10. Institutions Offering Both Two Years Graduate Study and Doctorate in the Superintendency ... 25
11. Relationship of Work Done on Specialist Degree to Doctoral Degree Program ... 25
12. Title of Award Recognizing Completion of Two Years of Graduate Study 25
13. Disciplines Available, Recommended, or Required in Graduate Preparation Programs for Superintendency ... 26
14. Program Elements Added to Preparation of School Administrators Since 1960-61 ... 27
15. Program Elements Deleted from Preparation of School Administrators Since 1960-61 ... 28
16. New Program Elements Contributing Most to the Improvement of Preparation Programs for School Administrators ... 28
17. Availability of Administrative Internships ... 29
18. Enrollment in Administrative Internships ... 30
19. Major Strengths in Superintendency Preparation Programs ... 31
20. Major Weaknesses in Superintendency Preparation Programs ... 31
21. Deterrents to Improving Preparation Programs for Superintendents ... 32
22. Inservice Programs for Superintendents Sponsored by Institutions of Higher Learning ... 33
23. Conferences for Administrators Sponsored by Institutions of Higher Learning ... 33
24. Length of School Administrator Conferences ... 33
25. Number of Superintendents Attending Inservice Conferences ... 34
26. Amount of Graduate Credit Carried by Inservice Education Programs for Superintendents ... 34

Table Page
27. Admission Requirements for Graduate Preparation for Superintendency 38
28. Tests Used in Determining Admission to Administrator Preparation Programs 38
29. Minimum Undergraduate Grade Point Averages for Admission to Graduate Preparation for Superintendency 39
30. Minimum Graduate Grade Point Averages for Admission to Advanced Graduate Preparation for Superintendency 40
31. Maximum Age for Admission to Graduate Preparation Programs for Superintendency 41
32. Teaching Experience Required for Admission to Graduate Preparation Programs for Superintendency 41
33. Administrative Experience Required for Admission to Graduate Preparation Programs for Superintendency 42
34. Full-Time Continuous Residence Requirements for Degree Programs in Educational Administration 42
35. Institutional Requirements for Completion of Graduate Preparation Programs for Superintendency 43
36. Per-Credit Tuition Costs for Part-Time Graduate Students 44
37. Per-Credit Tuition Costs for Full-Time Graduate Students 45
38. Scholarships and Fellowships Granted to Graduate Students Preparing for the Superintendency, 1969-70 46
39. Sources of Funds for Graduate Student Scholarships and Fellowships 47
40. Assistantships Awarded to Graduate Students Preparing for the Superintendency, 1969-70 47
41. Graduate Students Receiving Financial Aid from a School District for Their Superintendency Preparation 48
42. Graduate Students Obtaining Loans from Their Institutions of Higher Learning for Their Superintendency Preparation 48
43. Number of Students Admitted to Graduate Educational Administration Programs, 1969-70 51
44. Graduate Enrollments in Educational Administration Programs 51
45. Number of Full-Time and Part-Time Students Enrolled in Educational Administration Programs 52
46. Number of Active Candidates Not Enrolled as Full-Time or Part-Time Students, 1969-70 53
47. Percentage of Graduate Students in Educational Administration Having the Superintendency as Objective 53
48. Average Age of Full-Time Graduate Students in Educational Administration Programs 54
49. Age of Oldest Full-Time Graduate Students in Educational Administration Programs 54
50. Age of Youngest Full-Time Graduate Students in Educational Administration Programs 55
51. Percentage of Full-Time Graduate Students in Educational Administration Who Were Women 55
52. Number of Students Completing Master's Programs in Educational Administration, 1960-61 and 1968-69 56
53. Number of Students Completing Two-Year Graduate Programs in Educational Administration, 1960-61 and 1968-69 57
54. Number of Students Completing Ed.D. Programs in Educational Administration, 1960-61 and 1968-69 58
55. Number of Students Completing Ph.D. Programs in Educational Administration, 1960-61 and 1968-69 59
56. Number of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration, 1960-61 and 1969-70 61
57. Highest Academic Degrees Held by Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration, 1960-61 and 1969-70 62
58. Rank Distribution of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration 62

9

Table Page
59. Age Distribution of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration . . . 63
60. Age of Youngest Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration 63
61. Age of Oldest Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration 64
62. Sex of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration . . . 64
63. Professional Experience of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration . . . 65
64. Percentage of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration with Administrative Experience . . . 65
65. Academic Year Salary for Full-Time Faculty Members, 1969-70 . . . 66
66. Highest Twelve-Month Salaries Paid to Full-Time Faculty Members, 1969-70 . . . 66
67. Lowest Twelve-Month Salaries Paid to Full-Time Faculty Members, 1969-70 . . . 67
68. Fields of Specialization of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration . . . 68
69. Number of Part-Time Faculty Members in School Administration, 1960-61 and 1969-70 . . . 68
70. Highest Academic Degrees Held by Part-Time Faculty Members, 1960-61 and 1969-70 . . . 69
71. Percentage of Part-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration with Administrative Experience . . . 69
72. Travel Funds Allocated to Educational Administration Professors, 1969-70 70
73. Travel Funds Allocated per Professor . . . 70
74. Additional Travel Money from Special Projects . . . 71
75. Number of Secretaries in Educational Administration Departments . . . 72
76. Ratio of Professors to Secretaries . . . 72
77. Office Space for Professors of Educational Administration . . . 73
78. Issues Thought To Be Adequately Covered in Administrator Preparation Programs . . . 74
79. Neglected Issues That Should Be Included in Administrator Preparation Programs . . . 74
80. Professors' Ranking of Significant Issues Facing the School Superintendent 75

Chapter 1

Highlights of the Study

Background

Research on administrator preparation programs is relatively new. The present study builds on previous ones sponsored by AASA. The 1960 AASA Yearbook was concerned in part with preparation of administrators. A special 1964 report by the AASA Committee for the Advancement of School Administration was devoted entirely to this topic.

There were a number of self-study efforts by individual institutions prior to these efforts, but none was national in scope. After World War II, the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA) stimulated investigations into ways and means of improving educational administration preparation programs but performed no nationwide status study. The study of administrator preparation was furthered by the unique organizations of professors or institutions, such as the National Conference for Professors of Educational Administration and the University Council on Educational Administration (UCEA). These organizations, founded during the late 1940's or early 1950's, have done much to influence administrator preparation programs in the United States.

Sampling and Data Gathering

A total of 288 institutions believed to have educational administration programs in 1969-70 were surveyed—about the same number surveyed in 1962-63. This was believed to be a 100 percent sample. Two hundred and fifty institutions (about 87 percent) returned the questionnaire. The data-gathering instrument used in 1969-70 was similar to the one employed in 1962-63, but more comprehensive, more highly structured, and designed to facilitate electronic data processing. The final returns were received in November 1970.

Institutions with Graduate Preparation Programs for the Superintendency

Almost one-third of the institutions responding indicated no formal superintendency preparation programs leading to a graduate degree. Of the 168 institutions with degree programs, 125 were publicly supported and 43 were privately endowed. Including those who failed to participate in the study, the Commission estimated that about 196 universities in the nation offered graduate study for the superintendency in 1969-70, which was 23 more than in 1962-63. The majority (62.5 percent) of institutions with preparation programs for the superintendency granted doctorates. Most of these awarded both the Ed.D. and the Ph.D., rather than either one alone.

Practically all institutions preparing superintendents also had training programs for elementary principals, secondary school principals, and supervisors. Less than two-thirds, however, were engaged in developing junior college and university administrators.

Preparation programs for the superintendency were found in institutions located in all regions of the nation, but almost one-half were in the Midwest and South. The largest number with advanced graduate work were in the Midwest. Most of the universities terminating with only a master's degree were in the South.

All but a very small percentage of the institutions engaged in the preparation of school administrators were accredited. Better than 96 percent were accredited by some type of regional or national body through the master's, two-year, or doctoral programs. A higher percentage of public than of private universities were accredited by either a regional or a national body through various degree levels.

Small as well as large schools offered advanced graduate study, but in general, the larger the enrollment, the more likely an institution was to have a preparation program terminating with a doctor's degree. Thus, all institutions whose programs were limited to a master's had enrollments of less than 10,000, while over 50 percent of the universities where the highest graduate degree was a doctorate reported enrollments of 15,000 or more.

Preservice Programs

The two-year graduate study program was almost universally accepted and well established by the early 1960's. The publicly supported institutions were more likely than the privately endowed ones to provide programs leading to special recognition at the end of two years of graduate study. About one-third of the institutions allowed work completed during pursuit of a two-year degree to be applied toward the doctorate. There was no uniformity of titles recognizing completion of two years of graduate study, but the most popular seemed to be "specialist's degree," followed by "certificate."

The 1969-70 study confirmed the propensity to make experiences in disciplines other than education available, recommended, or required in graduate preparation programs for superintendents. Courses in sociology, statistics, economics, political science, business administration, and psychology were most likely to be recommended and/or required. Experiences in fields such as anthropology, history, philosophy, law, operations research, and computer technology were more likely to be available and less likely to be recommended or required.

Free responses to unstructured questions about preservice programs generated special problems in processing and reporting. No effort was made to identify the typical preparation program. The emphasis, instead, was on program changes. Administrative theory courses appeared to be the most frequent addition during the 1960's, followed by courses in the computer sciences, school plant, and community college administration. Administrative internships were the next most frequently mentioned new addition to preparation programs during the 1960's. It can be said that the theory movement, which hadn't quite caught hold at the time of the 1962-63 survey, was firmly established by the end of the 1960's.

In general, institutions were more likely to add new program elements than to delete old ones. About 29 percent indicated they made no deletions during the decade. The changes were most often in the form of adding a specific course in administration.

Greater use of the internship was cited most frequently as the single element that contributed most to the improvement of preparation programs for school administrators. Its importance was recognized in the early part of the decade as well. The typical institution in 1969-70 had fewer than five interns enrolled, but almost one in nine reported 20 or more interns. The median enrollment figure was computed to be seven students in the internship, if institutions with none were excluded.

Although the use of unstructured responses made it difficult to draw definitive conclusions, it was the opinion of the Commission that the major strengths and weaknesses of preparation programs cited in 1969-70 did not differ significantly from those reported in earlier research.

As in previous studies, the responding institutions in 1969-70 ranked inadequate funding as the biggest deterrent to preparation program improvement. The second most frequently mentioned deterrent was the lack of adequate secretarial staff, a problem scarcely mentioned in previous studies. In general, there was agreement among professors as to what constituted major strengths, major weaknesses, and major deterrents to the improvement of preparation programs. Unfortunately, this agreement has not been translated into strategies to enable institutions of higher learning to overcome problems and to capitalize on strengths.

Inservice Programs

The data in this study confirm what others have noted, namely, that institutions of higher learning concentrate their resources on preservice education and do relatively little for the continuing professional development of school administrators. Only three-fourths of the institutions reported any kind of inservice programs—usually conferences offering some graduate credit. These were typically few in number, of short duration, and attended by fewer than 50 administrators.

The content and nature of administrator preparation programs have not remained static during the past decade. The 1971 report (*The American School Superintendent*) by the Commission indicated that most superintendents perceived their graduate preparation as relevant and as a major source of strength in executing professional responsibilities.

Admission Standards and Degree Requirements

In 1969-70, a typical institution admitted 28 candidates to master's degree study, about 13 to two-year programs of graduate study, and about 16 to doctoral study. Wide variations were noted, however. More candidates were admitted to master's programs than to any other graduate level.

The present AASA study made no effort to collect data on recruitment of students for administrator preparation programs but did review admission requirements for those who presented themselves for whatever reason. There were relatively few changes in practices governing the admission of students to graduate programs in administration during the past decade. A variety of selection instruments continued to be used—written letters of recommendation, standardized test scores, grade point averages, character references, and completion of specific undergraduate courses, as well as oral exams and interviews. The two most frequently used tests were the Graduate Record Examination and the Miller's Analogies Test. A majority of the institutions employing these tests specified cutoff scores, but with no consistent pattern.

About a B average was likely to be required for admission to advanced graduate study. A 2.7 was the typical average demanded for entrance into the master's degree stream.

Age did not appear to be a factor in admitting graduate students to master's degree programs, but those over 40 were likely to encounter some problems when seeking to begin doctoral studies. Relatively few institutions responded to this part of the questionnaire, and conclusions must therefore be looked upon as highly tentative. A typical practice appeared to be not to accept new students for doctoral degree programs if they were 46 or older.

Most institutions required teaching experience, particularly for admission to advanced graduate study. Prior administrative experience, not usually required for master's degree candidates, was demanded of doctoral candidates in more than three-fourths of the universities. Similar requirements were noted in prior studies.

Residence requirements in degree programs in educational administration, particularly at the doctoral level, were more stringent than ever before. Full-time continuous residence was not likely to be demanded of master's degree students, but all institutions specified a period of residence for doctoral candidates in educational administration; this was most likely to be at least one year.

Practically all institutions required the thesis, written examination, and oral examination of those seeking a doctorate. There was clearly a trend toward the elimination of, or reduction in amount of, foreign language competency as a requirement for graduate programs in educational administration. Competency in a foreign language was not likely to be required of those pursuing the master's, two-year, or Ed.D. degree. Only about 60 percent of the institutions demanded mastery of one or more foreign languages for the Ph.D.

Cost of Graduate Study

Tuition costs continued to rise. They varied greatly among the public and private universities. The number and support level of fellowships and assistantships increased markedly during the past decade, almost quadrupling. The typical scholarship awarded during 1969-70 paid almost $4,300 for the year. Foundation and U.S. government grants accounted for almost 60 percent of such awards. More assistantships paid $5,000 and above than $2,000 or less. Doctoral degree candidates were most likely to receive top-paying financial awards.

Only a limited number of graduate students received financial aid from local districts. Even fewer obtained loans from their graduate institutions.

Enrollments

Enrollments increased markedly during the 1960's. The typical educational administration department had fewer than 100 graduate students enrolled in 1969-70. The range among institutions was very great, however.

There were more full-time students pursuing the Ed.D. than any other graduate degree. Most of the part-time students appeared to be working on the master's degree. There were about five times as many part-time as full-time students enrolled. In 1969 the typical institution had five full-time students enrolled in master's degree programs, three full-time students in two-year programs, 14 full-time students in Ed.D. study, and seven full-time students in Ph.D. study. The Commission estimates that there were 4,200 full-time students and over 21,000 part-time students enrolled in various graduate degree programs in educational administration in 1969-70. If those in active candidacy for some type of degree in educational administration but not enrolled in 1969-70 are added, the total swells to an estimated 55,200.

Only about 35 percent of the graduate students in educational administration had the superintendency as an objective. The average age of the full-time enrollees was about 33; the oldest student was about 48 and the youngest about 25. More than 90 percent of the full-time enrollees were men.

The number of graduate degrees awarded in educational administration increased sharply from 1960-61 to 1968-69. The number of master's degree completions per institution jumped from 18 in 1960-61 to 25 in 1968-69. Specialist degree completions more than tripled during the period, Ed.D. completions almost doubled, and Ph.D. completions more than quadrupled. The annual Ed.D. production in 1968-69 was estimated to be 800, or double the annual Ph.D. production of 400.

The AASA Commission estimated that about 7,500 graduate degrees in educational administration were awarded in 1968-69, with over one-third (2,625) of the recipients having the superintendency as their goal.

The Faculty

The day of the one-man department of educational administration has all but disappeared. The number of full-time and part-time faculty members in educational administration almost tripled during the 1960's. The typical department had about two full-time members in 1960-61, compared with six in 1969-70. There appeared to be no significant difference between public and private institutions in the size of full-time staffs. It was noted that 45 percent of the institutions had fewer than five full-time professors. The Commission estimated the total number of full-time professors of educational administration in 1969-70 to be 1,050.

The number of part-time faculty members in the typical department grew from two in 1960-61 to five in 1969-70. There were over 840 part-time faculty in the responding institutions in 1969-70. The Commission estimated that about 1,000 part-time personnel were employed in all institutions. The total number of full- and part-time faculty members in 1969-70 was about 2,050.

Practically all full-time and part-time professors in educational administration held a doctor's degree. There was little change in the academic qualifications of professors during the past decade.

The professorship in educational administration remained a man's world. The typical full-time professor of educational administration was likely to be about 46. More than three-fourths held the rank of associate professor or higher. The majority had administrative experience. The 12-month salary in 1969-70 ranged from less than $14,500 to more than $20,600. The highest salary recorded was $40,000.

The number of specializations in educational administration is growing. Most frequently listed were school finance, "general administration," administrative theory, school law, school facilities, and personnel administration.

Resources Available to Faculty

Universities provided only limited travel money for professors. Typically a professor had less than $200 of university money available to him for travel in 1969-70. These funds, however, were sometimes supplemented by travel money available through special projects. There was a wide variation among the universities in travel allocations.

The typical department of educational administration had only two secretaries. Very often a single secretary worked for three different professors. Most professors had an office of their own. Public institutions appeared to be more crowded than private ones insofar as office space was concerned.

Perception of Issues

The correlation of rankings given to significant issues facing the school superintendency by professors in institutions of higher learning and by superintendents was found to be a positive 0.475, which is significant at the 5 percent level. Professors were closer to large-district superintendents than to small-district superintendents in their perceptions of significant issues. The number one issue facing the schools, according to professors, was the social-cultural one, covering such matters as race relations, integration, and segregation. The superintendents ranked this issue number eleven and educational finance number one.

Chapter 2

Precedents and Procedures

AASA status studies of the characteristics of the American school superintendent have a history that goes back 50 years. However, formal and comprehensive studies of professional preparation programs for the superintendency are, by and large, post-World War II efforts. The earliest of these efforts can be traced to the AASA Committee for the Advancement of School Administration (CASA) during the 1950's. It was CASA that recommended that new persons seeking active membership in the American Association of School Administrators be required to have completed at least *two* years of *graduate* study in *educational administration* (at an accredited institution). This recommendation was adopted as a membership policy in 1958 and has been in force since January 1, 1964. It has made AASA one of the very few professional societies in education with a professional preparation criterion for voting membership.

CASA and CPEA

Prior to the activities of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA) and the AASA Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, numerous institutional self-study efforts focused on program improvements and brought suggestions of change, but these isolated and uncoordinated thrusts influenced relatively few others. The CPEA centers with their national perspective were destined to have a greater impact. Moore[1] described the post-World War II beginnings of the unique CPEA, which sought to stimulate study and eventual improvement of educational administration preparation programs as well as further professionalization of the school superintendency. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation funded specific university projects related to the CPEA regional centers. This Foundation also allocated a series of grants for what in the beginning was called the "Development Committee of the AASA" and later became the AASA Committee for the Advancement of School Administration (CASA). CASA has been a creative force. In addition to the preparation criterion for membership, this committee stimulated the creation of the AASA Code of Ethics and the AASA National Academy for School Executives.

A variety of significant and formative actions in educational administration were unleashed by the CPEA in the late 1940's. More than 300 CPEA studies probed into the nature of the superintendency and the relevance of graduate training programs for school administrators. Most of these investigations were reported during the 1950's. That decade saw a significant outpouring of professional programs for school administrators. However, a nationwide review of institutional preparation programs for school administration was not attempted until the end of that decade.

NCPEA and UCEA

The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) was organized in 1946 through the efforts of the late Dr. Walter Cocking, then editor of *The School Executive*. For the first time this informal nationwide association brought together professors of educational administration to exchange ideas and find ways and means of promoting the further professionalization of administration. In August 1971 NCPEA celebrated its twenty-fifth birthday. It continues to attract about 100 professors, and most bring their families to its annual weeklong sessions. NCPEA is an informal, semistructured organization with no annual dues for individual professors other than a modest annual conference fee for those who attend.

The University Council on Educational Administration (UCEA), in contrast, started in the late 1950's with a professional secretariat to carry on studies of educational administration and special inservice programs for professors. Its operational base was originally at Teachers College, Columbia University. Headquarters were subsequently moved to the Ohio State University campus in Columbus, Ohio, where they remain. The full-time professional staff of UCEA has expanded modestly, and the number of member institutions has grown from about thirty to about sixty. NCPEA and UCEA continue to focus on similar goals of improving preparation programs in educational administration, but with independent activities and only limited interaction.

---

[1] Moore, Hollis A., Jr. *Studies in School Administration.* A report on the CPEA. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1957. 202 pp.

The 1960 AASA Yearbook

The last of the AASA yearbooks.[2] published in 1960, focused on the status of the superintendency in 1958-59 and reported the first nationwide survey of professional preparation. This survey, based on 1958-59 practices, called for selected superintendents of schools each to contact one of 303 institutions of higher learning to complete an unstructured questionnaire. "An unbelievable 97 percent return was obtained."[3] The report outlined admission requirements for graduate study, preparation program strengths and weaknesses, course requirements, status of the internships, the number of full- and part-time students enrolled, and selected university staff characteristics. The writers admitted, "Even though this study was done with considerable care, the content of the questionnaire was of such a nature as to make it very difficult to get reliable data."[4]

The 1960 Yearbook recommended a model program of preparation for school administrators which would require the development of technical, human and conceptual skills and would have the following general characteristics:

1. At least two years of graduate study would be necessary, assuming that the individual already had strong undergraduate foundations in the social sciences, the natural and physical sciences, the communications arts, philosophy, and one or more of the fine arts.
2. The program would be designed for individuals who had been discriminatingly selected.
3. The necessary resources, both human and material, would include a strong faculty with demonstrated competencies in scholarly pursuits, in teaching, and in the practice of educational administration, together with adequate libraries, laboratories, materials centers, and space for classrooms and offices.[5]

Research in the 1960's

In 1962 the UCEA published *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives,*[6] a set of 10 papers that had been presented at a national conference and supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education in 1961. UCEA has continued to publish a large number of sharply focused articles, treatises, position papers, and books on specialized aspects of administrative preparation programs and has developed new instructional strategies for the preparation of school administrators. A comprehensive research effort by UCEA on university-based preparation programs for educational leaders was released in December 1969.[7] Data were collected from administrators with an earned doctorate from UCEA institutions. This federally funded study is related to but does not duplicate the data collected for the present report.

The most closely related AASA-sponsored research was a 1964 report issued by its Committee for the Advancement of School Administration (CASA).[8] It was perhaps the most exhaustive study of preparation programs for the superintendency to that point and was based on practices in 1962-63. Joining Dr. J. C. Wright, then CASA secretary, in the analysis of the data was the late Dr. John A. Ramseyer, professor at the Ohio State University. The present report will make frequent reference to this 1962-63 CASA study.

The Present Study

The Commission on the Preparation of Professional School Administrators was appointed in 1968 and charged with reviewing what had happened to the superintendency and preparation for it in the previous decade. The Commission's first publication, a profile of the superintendency in 1969-70,[9] was released in August 1971. Together with the present study of preparation programs, it provides the basic data and documentation necessary for the more comprehensive third report that is to follow. The original Commission membership reflected the interests and concerns both of practitioners in the field and of those serving in universities.[10]

Sampling Procedures

The 1962-63 CASA study mailed questionnaires to a 100 percent sample of 289 colleges and universities identified by officials of state departments of education as offering approved preparation of school administrators. The institutions surveyed in the present (1969-70) study are not precisely the same as those included in the 1962-63 effort. Public and private institutions of higher learning offering preparation of school administrators in 1969-70 are listed in Appendices A, B, C, and D by state and by types of programs offered.

---

[2] American Association of School Administrators. *Professional Administrators for America's Schools.* Thirty-Eight Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1960. 310 pp.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

[6] Culbertson, Jack A., and Hencley, Stephen P., editors. Columbus, Ohio: UCEA, 1962. 173 pp.

[7] Culbertson, Jack, *et al. Preparing Education Leaders for the '70's.* Final Report, Project #8-0230. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, December 1969. 568 pp. (Mimeo.)

[8] AASA Committee for the Advancement of School Administration. *The Professional Preparation of Superintendents of Schools.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1964. 71 pp.

[9] AASA Commission on the Preparation of Professional School Administrators. *The American School Superintendent.* (Edited by S. J. Knezevich.) Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1971. 65 pp.

[10] The Commission included the following four superintendents: Dr. R. L. Chisholm, superintendent, Arlington, Va.; Dr. R. D. Gilberts, then superintendent, Denver, Colo. (presently dean, College of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene); Dr. J. A. Sensenbaugh, state superintendent, Baltimore, Md.; and Dr. E. L. Whigham, superintendent, Dade County, Miami, Fla. The four university representatives were Dr. L. L. Cunningham, dean, College of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus; Dr. R. T. Gregg, professor, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Dr. T. T. Tucker, Jr., professor and department chairman, University of Nevada, Reno; and Dr. D. J. Willower, Pennsylvania State University, University Park. Dr. S. J. Knezevich, then AASA associate secretary (now professor, University of Wisconsin), served as Commission chairman.

The total of 288 institutions believed to have educational administration programs in 1969-70 was only one less than the 1962-63 total. In both instances a 100 percent sample of institutions preparing school administrators was used. It must be stated, however, that the identification of institutions having preparation programs for the superintendency was not always accurate; thus, in the 1962-63 study all of the 289 institutions returned the questionnaire, but 77 indicated no preparation programs for the superintendency. Of the 288 institutions canvased during 1969-70, 250 (86.8 percent) returned the questionnaire, of which 82 had no preparation programs.

Design of the Data-Gathering Instrument

The questionnaire used in 1969-70, patterned in part after the one prepared for the 1962-63 study, was produced by the Commission as a whole. It took almost 12 months of deliberation to produce the type of instrument deemed satisfactory for the purposes of the study. The result was a more highly structured questionnaire to ensure more precise responses. The instrument was designed to facilitate electronic processing of data. It was much larger than previous ones, to provide additional information needed for a more comprehensive profile and to clarify items that appeared to have created interpretation difficulties in prior studies. A copy of the data-gathering instrument used to project the 1970 profile of preparation programs can be found in Appendix E. It is a complex instrument and required a large number of important responses from institutional representatives. The Commission members, along with the officers and staff of AASA, take this ocassion to thank the 250 representatives of institutions of higher learning who took time off from their very crowded schedules to accurately and objectively provide the data requested.

Two copies of the data-gathering instrument were mailed to each institution in mid-October 1969. A third copy was sent, with an appropriate cover letter, to those who did not respond to the initial request. A postcard reminder went out in mid-January 1970 to those who still had not replied. A fourth effort to obtain a 100 percent response was made in October 1970. A few major institutions failed to cooperate even after a personal telephone call was made. Data processing began after all efforts to obtain responses from the few remaining institutions proved unsuccessful. The sample was sufficiently large to ensure an accurate picture of university-based preparation programs in 1969-70.

An initial computer printout on the responses received was completed in May 1970 and reviewed by the Commission. The errors and omissions detected in this initial analysis were corrected manually during the summer and fall of 1970. The size of the sample permitted the manual corrections and facilitated analysis of the limited number of unstructured responses. The careful triple checking of data analysis helped to ensure high quality and accuracy in the data organized for this study. Preparation of the manuscript and further organization of the research study took place in Madison, Wisconsin, from December 1970 through September 1971.

Summary

Nationwide research on administrator preparation is a post-World War II phenomenon. Although CPEA helped to stimulate inquiry into ways of improving administrator preparation, comprehensive studies were first reported in the 1960 AASA Yearbook and in the 1964 CASA special report. The present study of preparation programs for the superintendency was conducted by the AASA Commission for the Preparation of Professional School Administrators during the 1969-70 school year. It is one of three prepared by this Commission. The number of institutions contacted in this study was approximately but not precisely the same as the number contacted by CASA in 1962-63. The 1962-63 study was able to obtain a 100 percent response. In the present study, seven out of eight institutions responded.

The data-gathering instrument used in the 1969-70 study was patterned after the one prepared in 1962-63 but was more complex, more comprehensive, and more highly structured.

Chapter 3

Institutions with Graduate Preparation Programs for the School Superintendency

The data in this study are based on 168 institutions that offered at least a master's degree in educational administration in 1969-70. Comparisons of samples used in 1962-63 and in 1969-70 are presented in Table 1. These data lead to the estimate that approximately 196 institutions, rather than the 288 assumed or the 168 responding affirmatively to the questionnaire, offered degree programs in educational administration in 1969-70. The estimate in 1962-63 was 173. If these estimates are accurate, the number of institutions involved in administrator preparation increased by more than 13 percent during the decade.

Type of Institutional Control

Classification of those responding to the 1969-70 questionnaire by type of institutional control is indicated in Table 2. Almost three-fourths (74.4 percent) of the institutions with preparation programs could be classified as publicly supported, with the remainder being privately supported. The line separating publicly and privately supported institutions is not quite as precise as it once was. Four or five institutions that were once considered privately supported now receive a substantial amount of funds from state governmental appropriations. It should be noted that over 97 percent of the privately endowed institutions surveyed returned the questionnaire, as compared with less than 83 percent of the public colleges and universities. Estimates indicate that about 146 publicly supported and about 50 privately supported schools offered graduate training in school administration in 1969-70, but this study will be based on the 125 publicly supported and the 43 privately supported institutions that returned the data-gathering instrument.

TABLE 1. Number of Colleges and Universities Reporting, 1962-63 and 1969-70

	1962-63 study	1969-70 study
Number of colleges and universities believed to be preparing school administrators	289	288
Percentage of institutions receiving questionnaires	100.0%	100.0%
Number of institutions returning questionnaires	289	250
Percentage of return	100.0%	86.8%
Number of responding institutions with no preparation programs for the superintendency	77	82
Number of responding institutions engaged in preparing school superintendents	212	168

TABLE 2. Type of Institutional Control for Institutions Responding, 1969-70

	Public	Private	All types
Number of institutions included in 1969-70 AASA study	211	77	288
Sample as percentage of total population	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of institutions returning questionnaires	175	75	250
Percentage of return	82.9%	97.4%	86.8%
Number of responding institutions with no preparation programs for the superintendency	51	31	82
Number of responding institutions engaged in preparing school superintendents	125	43	168

Study Levels Offered

About one in ten (10.4 percent) of the publicly supported institutions and about one in nine (11.6 percent) of the privately supported institutions had programs limited to the master's degree. Almost three in ten (29.6 percent) of the public colleges and universities and less than two in ten (18.6 percent) in the private sector offered no graduate study beyond the specialist level, or two years of graduate study beyond the bachelor's degree.

At the other extreme of the preparation spectrum, 60 percent of the publicly supported schools and almost 70 percent of the privately endowed institutions had programs terminating with some type of doctorate. It can be concluded that the majority (62.5 percent) of all types of institutions of higher learning with preparation programs for the superintendency granted doctor's degrees. These data are summarized in Table 3.

In 1962-63, in contrast, 56.3 percent[1] of the institutions with degree programs in educational administration terminated with the doctorate. In that year, 50.5 percent awarded both the Ed.D. and the Ph.D., as compared with 43.8 percent in 1969-70. Similarly, 18.4 percent and 31.1 percent offered only the Ph.D. and Ed.D., respectively, in 1962-63, in contrast to 21.9 percent and 34.3 percent in 1969-70. It can be concluded that although more institutions continued to grant both the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. than any single doctorate alone, the percentage offering each doctoral degree and the "mix" of such degrees changed somewhat from 1962-63 to 1969-70.

Other Preparation Programs

Table 4 summarizes information on preparation for administrative positions other than the superintendency. Over 98 percent of the 168 institutions returning questionnaires offered preparation programs for elementary and secondary school principalships. A majority of these programs (58.2 percent for the elementary school principalship and 57.2 percent for the secondary school principalship) terminated with the doctorate.

---

[1] The 29 institutions that stated in 1962-63 that "courses only" (no degrees) were available have been excluded from these computations.

TABLE 3. Highest Degree Offered in Preparation Programs for School Superintendency

Highest degree offered	Public institutions				Private institutions				All types			
	No.		Percent		No.		Percent		No.		Percent	
	Subtotal	Total	Subtotal	Total	Subtotal	Total	Subtotal	Total	Subtotal	Total	Subtotal	Total
Master's degree		13		10.4%		5		11.6%		18		10.7%
Specialist or two-year program degree		37		29.6		8		18.6		45		26.8
Doctor's degree Ed.D. only	25		20.0%		11		25.6%		36		34.3%	
Ph.D. only	16		12.8		7		16.2		23		21.9	
Ed.D. and Ph.D.	34		27.2		12		27.9		46		43.8	
Total offering some type of doctorate		75		60.0%		30		69.8%		105	100.0%	62.5%
Total institutions responding		125		100.0%		43		100.0%		168		100.0%
Total institutions not responding	0				0				0			

TABLE 4. Highest Degree in Preparation Programs for Administrative Positions Other than Superintendency

Administrative position	Institutions where highest degree offered was						Total with some type of degree		Percentage[a] indicating preparation programs
	Master's		Two-year or specialist		Doctorate				
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
Elementary principal	21	12.7%	48	29.1%	96	58.2%	165	100.0%	98.2%
Secondary school principal	22	13.3	49	29.5	95	57.2	166	100.0	98.8
Supervisor of instruction	28	17.6	39	24.5	92	57.9	159	100.0	94.6
College administrator and professor	5	4.6	15	13.9	88	81.5	108	100.0	64.3
Junior college administrator	6	5.8	16	15.4	82	78.8	104	100.0	61.9

[a] Based on a total sample of 168.

TABLE 5. Location of Institutions with Graduate Programs in School Administration

Regional location	Institutions where highest degree program offered was						All degrees	
	Master's		Two-year or specialist		Doctorate			
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Midwest	3	16.7%	14	31.1%	34	32.4%	51	30.4%
South	6	33.3	7	15.6	17	16.2	30	17.9
Rocky Mountain	2	11.1	8	17.7	14	13.3	24	14.3
Middle Atlantic	1	5.5	3	6.7	19	18.1	23	13.7
Far West	2	11.1	6	13.3	8	7.6	16	9.5
New England	3	16.7	4	8.9	5	4.8	12	7.1
Southwest	1	5.5	3	6.7	8	7.6	12	7.1
Totals	18	99.9%	45	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%
Institutions responding	18	100.0%	45	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%
Institutions not responding	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total institutions	18	100.0%	45	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%

Preparation for supervisors of instruction was available in almost 95 percent of the schools responding. Almost 58 percent of such programs led to the doctorate.

Less than two-thirds of the institutions were engaged in the preparation of junior college administrators, university administrators, and professors of educational administration. About 62 percent had programs for junior college administrators and about 64 percent for other college administrators and professors of educational administration. It should be noted that a substantially higher percentage of the institutions preparing junior college (78.8 percent) and four-year college (81.5 percent) administrators offered programs that terminated with a doctorate.

Regional Distribution of Institutions

The regional distribution of institutions of higher learning offering graduate programs in educational administration is reported in Table 5. There were no comparable data in earlier studies to permit analysis of trends or shifts. About 30 percent of all institutions offering such programs in 1969-70 were located in the Midwest, 17.9 percent in the South, 14.3 percent in the Rocky Mountain area, and 13.7 percent in the Middle Atlantic states. Smaller percentages were in the Far West, New England, and the Southwest.

Most of the institutions terminating administrator preparation programs with a master's degree were in the South (about 33 percent). The fewest such institutions were in the Middle Atlantic and Southwest, each with 5.5 percent of the total.

The largest number of institutions offering graduate work terminating with a two-year degree program were located in the Midwest (31.1 percent). The fewest institutions terminating programs with a two-year degree were in the Middle Atlantic and Southwest states (6.7 percent each).

The largest number of institutions offering doctorates in educational administration were in the Midwest (32.4 percent). The New England states had the fewest (4.8 percent).

Data reported in Table 5 permit the conclusion that preparation programs could be found in all regions of the United States. Almost one-half (48.3 percent) were in the Midwest and South.

Accreditation

Data on accreditation of institutions of higher learning with graduate programs in school administration are summarized in Table 6. Such data were not reported in previous studies. Table 6 permits the conclusion that public and private universities and colleges were more likely to acquire regional than national accreditation through various graduate degree levels. Of the public institutions, 95.8 percent were accredited through the doctorate by a regional accrediting agency, as opposed to 76.4 percent accredited through the same level by a national accreditation agency such as the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Public institutions of higher learning were more likely than private institutions to be accredited by either a regional or a national body through various degree levels. Of the private universities, 16.7 percent were not accredited through the doctorate by a regional agency, as compared with only 4.2 percent of the public universities. One-third of the private schools, in contrast to less than one-fourth of the public institutions, were not accredited through the doctorate by NCATE.

In general, however, better than 96 percent of all types of institutions with graduate programs in school administration were accredited by some type of regional or national body through the master's, two-year, or doctoral programs. If accreditation is assumed to be an indicator of quality, it can be said that all but a very small percentage of the institutions engaged in the preparation of school administrators in 1969-70 carried this mark of quality.

Institutional Enrollments

Although small as well as large schools offer advanced graduate degrees, the larger the institution the more likely it is to terminate its administrator preparation program with a doctorate. This is evident from the data organized in Table 7. The average enrollment in institutions whose preparation efforts led only to a master's degree was 5,388. In contrast, the average enrollment in institutions whose training programs terminated with a doctorate was 14,855—more than two and one-half times as great. Stated another way, *all* of the institutions whose programs were limited to a master's had institutional enrollments of less than 10,000, whereas over 50 percent of the institutions where the highest graduate degree was a doctorate had enrollments of 15,000 or more. No institution with an enrollment of under 2,500

TABLE 6. Accreditation of Institutions with Graduate Programs in School Administration

Type of institution	Regional accreditation through						National accreditation through						Any type of accreditation through					
	Master's		Two-year		Doctorate		Master's		Two-year		Doctorate		Master's		Two-year		Doctorate	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Public																		
Accredited	100	98.0%	96	96.0%	69	95.8%	92	88.5%	79	78.2%	55	76.4%	103	98.1%	99	97.1%	70	97.2%
Not accredited	2	2.0	4	4.0	3	4.2	12	11.5	22	21.8	17	23.6	2	1.9	3	2.9	2	2.8
Private																		
Accredited	32	86.5	19	70.4	25	83.3	28	73.7	18	64.3	20	66.7	37	97.4	26	92.9	28	93.3
Not accredited	5	13.5	8	29.6	5	16.7	10	26.3	10	35.7	10	33.3	1	2.6	2	7.1	2	6.7
Institutions not responding																		
Public	3	75.0	2	66.7	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	0	0	0	0	1	100.0
Private	1	25.0	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All types																		
Accredited	132	95.0	115	90.6	94	92.2	120	84.5	97	75.2	75	73.5	140	97.9	125	96.2	98	96.1
Not accredited	7	5.0	12	9.4	8	7.8	22	15.5	32	24.8	27	26.5	3	2.1	5	3.8	4	3.9
Total	139	100.0%	127	100.0%	102	100.0%	142	100.0%	129	100.0%	102	100.0%	143	100.0%	130	100.0%	102	100.0%
Institutions responding	139	82.7%	127	75.6%	102	97.1%	142	84.5%	129	76.8%	102	97.1%	143	85.1%	130	77.4%	102	97.1%
Institutions not responding	9	5.4	4	2.4	3	2.9	6	3.6	2	1.2	3	2.9	5	3.0	1	0.6	3	2.9
Institutions without programs	20	11.9	37	22.0	0	0	20	11.9	37	22.0	0	0	20	11.9	37	22.0	0	0
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%

offered a doctorate as a terminal degree for its superintendency preparation program in 1969-70.

Graduate school enrollments, as opposed to total institutional enrollments, are presented in Table 8. School of education enrollments are shown in Table 9. Data from these two tables support the conclusion reached from Table 7. Graduate school enrollments in institutions with superintendency preparation programs that terminated with a doctorate showed a tremendous range—from 125 to 11,000, with average and median enrollments of 2,802 and 2,392, respectively.

Summary

Almost one-third of the 250 institutions responding (32.8 percent) indicated no formal preparation for the superintendency. Of the 168 institutions reporting degree programs, 125 were publicly supported and 43 were privately endowed. It was estimated that about 196 institutions in all offered graduate preparation for the school superintendency in 1969-70, compared with about 173 in 1962-63. Sixty percent of the public institutions and almost 70 percent of the privately controlled ones had programs leading to a doctorate. More institutions continued to grant both the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. than any one type of doctorate alone.

Almost all institutions of higher learning with programs for the superintendency provided preparation programs for elementary and secondary school principals. Almost as many offered training for supervisors of instruction as well. Only 61.9 percent indicated preparation programs for junior college administrators and 64.3 percent for four-year college administrators.

Institutions of higher learning with graduate programs in educational administration can be found throughout the United States. The highest percentages, however, are in the Midwest (30.4 percent) and the South (17.9 percent of the total). The South had about one-third of all the institutions terminating with a master's degree program in educational administration. Almost one-third (32.4 percent) of the universities and colleges with doctoral degree programs in educational administration were in the Midwest. New England and the Southwest had the smallest percentages of institutions with graduate programs in educational administration.

Both public and private institutions of higher learning with graduate programs in school administration in 1969 were far more likely to be accredited by either a regional or a national body than not to be accredited at all. Public universities and colleges were more likely to be accredited through a regional or national body than were private schools. Both public and private institutions were more likely to be recognized by a regional accreditation agency than by a national accreditation body such as NCATE.

Although both large and small institutions provided

TABLE 7. Total Enrollments in Institutions with Superintendency Preparation Programs

Institutional enrollment	Institutions where highest graduate degree was						Total	
	Master's		Two-year or specialist		Doctorate			
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
20,000 or more	0	0 %	1	2.8%	26	30.2%	27	20.0%
17,500 to 19,999	0	0	0	0	10	11.6	10	7.4
15,000 to 17,499	0	0	0	0	8	9.3	8	5.9
12,500 to 14,999	0	0	1	2.8	13	15.1	14	10.4
10,000 to 12,499	0	0	5	13.9	6	7.0	11	8.1
7,500 to 9,999	4	30.8	8	22.2	12	14.0	24	17.8
5,000 to 7,499	4	30.8	11	30.6	6	7.0	21	15.6
2,500 to 4,999	1	7.7	8	22.2	5	5.8	14	10.4
Under 2,500	4	30.8	2	5.6	0	0	6	4.4
Totals	13	100.0%	36	100.1%	86	100.0%	135	100.0%
Institutions responding	13	72.2%	36	80.0%	86	81.9%	135	80.4%
Institutions not responding	5	27.8	9	20.0	19	18.1	33	19.6
Total institutions	18	100.0%	45	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average enrollment	5,388		7,291		14,855		11,917	
Median enrollment	6,874		6,931		13,364		10,681	
Range—highest	17,900		23,000		50,000		50,000	
Range—lowest	916		1,600		2,000		916	

advanced graduate work, the larger the institution, the more likely it was to have its program for preparing superintendents lead to a doctorate. Over 50 percent of the institutions with a doctorate had enrollments of 15,000 or more. The average size of universities offering a doctorate was more than two and one-half times that of the schools offering only lower degrees.

TABLE 8. Graduate School Enrollments in Institutions with Superintendency Programs

Graduate school enrollment	Institutions where highest graduate degree was						Total	
	Master's		Two-year or specialist		Doctorate			
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
5,000 or more	0	0 %	1	2.9%	17	20.7%	18	14.1%
4,000 to 4,999	0	0	0	0	8	9.8	8	6.3
3,000 to 3,999	0	0	0	0	7	8.5	7	5.5
2,000 to 2,999	2	16.7	0	0	14	17.1	16	12.5
1,000 to 1,999	1	8.3	11	32.4	18	22.0	30	23.4
750 to 999	2	16.7	1	2.9	13	15.9	16	12.5
500 to 749	2	16.7	9	26.5	3	3.7	14	10.9
250 to 499	4	33.3	8	23.5	1	1.2	13	10.2
Under 250	1	8.3	4	11.8	1	1.2	6	4.7
Totals	12	100.0%	34	100.0%	82	100.1%	128	100.1%
Institutions responding	12	66.7%	34	75.6%	82	78.1%	128	87.2%
Institutions not responding	6	33.3	11	24.4	23	21.9	40	12.8
Total institutions	18	100.0%	45	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average enrollment	886		941		2,802		2,128	
Median enrollment	638		652		2,392		1,516	
Range—highest	2,500		5,362		11,000		11,000	
Range—lowest	150		132		125		125	

TABLE 9. School of Education Enrollments in Institutions with Superintendency Preparation Programs

School of education enrollment	Institutions where highest graduate degree was						Total	
	Master's		Two-year or specialist		Doctorate			
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
7,500 or more	0	0 %	1	3.2%	1	1.3%	2	1.6%
5,000 to 7,499	0	0	3	9.7	7	8.8	10	8.1
2,500 to 4,999	0	0	4	12.9	21	26.3	25	20.3
2,000 to 2,499	1	8.3	1	3.2	9	11.3	11	8.9
1,000 to 1,999	3	25.0	11	35.5	16	20.0	30	24.4
500 to 999	2	16.7	3	9.7	13	16.3	18	14.6
Under 500	6	50.0	8	25.8	13	16.3	27	22.0
Totals	12	100.0%	31	100.0%	80	100.3%	123	99.9%
Institutions responding	12	66.7%	31	68.9%	80	76.2%	123	73.2%
Institutions not responding	6	33.3	14	31.1	25	23.8	45	26.8
Total institutions	18	100.0%	45	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average enrollment	813		2,113		2,356		2,144	
Median enrollment	624		1,454		1,905		1,566	
Range—highest	2,300		7,500		10,407		10.407	
Range—lowest	60		77		161		60	

Chapter 4

Preservice and Inservice Programs for the Superintendency

Preparation of specialized personnel for positions in school administration is a relatively new development and traces its origins to selected institutions in the United States around the turn of the century. Program content has changed over the years in response to needs of practitioners and new insights into the nature of educational administration. Moore, in his summary of trends in administrator education during the CPEA days of the 1950's,[1] cited a sizeable number of developments: the adoption of new courses of study, adaptation and revision of existing courses, use of larger blocks of time, integration of content around broad areas, team teaching, involvement of other disciplines and other subject areas in the training of school administrators, use of public elementary and secondary schools as laboratories for internships, and improved research requirements for graduate students in educational administration. He listed the following weak spots in administrator preparation: lack of agreement within the profession on the core of content that should be offered, tendency to focus on specialized training in administration, particularly at the graduate level, without regard to the total education including undergraduate experiences, deadening repetition of content of some courses, problems generated by traditional requirements imposed by universitywide graduate councils, inadequate attention to administration processes, and inability to appraise the involvement of other disciplines in the training of administrators.[2]

Previous analyses by Moore of developments in preparation programs for the school superintendency during the 1950's, as well as those reported in the 1960 AASA Yearbook[3] and by the AASA Committee for the Advancement of School Administration,[4] will be compared with data compiled by the present study on conditions during the year 1969-70. Preparation program content ideally is relevant to the types of experiences and problems currently encountered by superintendents of schools. This chapter will review the elements added to and deleted from preparation programs to increase their relevance, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of preparation programs in 1969-70. It will also review inservice activities of institutions of higher learning. If administration demands continuing professional development, then the preservice experiences are better conceived as the initial phase and the so-called inservice activities as the continuing phase of professional growth for the administrator.

Graduate Programs and Degrees

As indicated in the previous chapter, a large majority of the institutions offering preparation programs for the school superintendency in 1969-70 terminated them with a doctorate. Only about one in ten universities and colleges limited training to the master's degree level. Since the end of World War II work beyond the master's but not quite to the doctoral level, known as the two-year program of study for the superintendency, has become well established. The CASA study declared in 1964 that "colleges and universities almost universally accept the two-year program as a minimum program of preparation of school superintendents."[5] Two-year programs have increased. Approximately 27 percent of the institutions in 1969-70 listed the two-year graduate program as the highest they offered, compared with about 15 percent in 1962-63.

A problem may arise when both the two-year program and the doctorate are available. Data summarized in Table 10 show that 29.6 percent of the public and 18.6 percent of the private universities offered the two-year degree as their highest graduate study award. A little over one-fourth (26.8 percent) of all types of institutions responding to the AASA questionnaire offered only two years of graduate study. The majority (51.2 percent), however, gave students who could qualify an option between recognition for completing two years of graduate study and the doctorate. Only about one in nine (11.3 percent) offered the doctorate but no two-year program; these were more likely to be privately supported institutions.

When a student starts work on the two-year degree, believing it to be his maximum graduate study effort, and later changes his mind and seeks to shift into the doctoral stream, the issue arises, What value shall be attached to work done toward the specialist degree as partial progress toward the doctorate? About one-third of the institutions (33.7 percent) allowed work completed during pursuit of a specialist or two-year degree to be applied toward the doctorate; 66.3 percent would not count the credits earned as progress toward the doctorate. These data are summarized in Table 11.

---

[1] Moore, Hollis A., Jr. *Studies in School Administration.* A Report on the CPEA. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1957. pp. 65-68.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 68-70.

[3] American Association of School Administrators. *Professional Administrators for America's Schools.* 38th Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1960. pp. 54-115.

[4] AASA Committee for the Advancement of School Administrators. *The Professional Preparation of Superintendents of Schools.* Washington, D.C.: AASA, 1964. 71 pp.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

Table 12 shows how far we were from having a single universal title for an award to recognize the completion of two years of graduate study in 1969-70. The "specialist" degree designation was used by 44.3 percent of the institutions, "certificate" by 35.2 percent. About 20 percent of the institutions used "diploma" or some other designation. Whether the 1970's will witness a movement toward a more commonly recognized title remains to be seen.

TABLE 10. Institutions Offering Both Two Years of Graduate Study and Doctorate in the Superintendency

Type of institution	Institutions with								Institutions responding	
	Less than two years of graduate study		Two years of study only		Two years of study and doctorate		Doctorate but no two-year programs			
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Publicly supported	13	10.4%	37	29.6%	65	52.0%	10	8.0%	125	100.0%
Privately supported	5	11.6	8	18.6	21	48.8	9	20.9	43	99.9
All types	18	10.7%	45	26.8%	86	51.2%	19	11.3%	168	100.0%

TABLE 11. Relationship of Work Done on Specialist Degree to Doctoral Degree Program

Relationship	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
Specialist degree terminal—no work on it applies to doctorate	61	66.3%
Specialist degree credits can be applied toward doctorate	31	33.7
Total	92	100.0%
Institutions responding	92	87.6%
Institutions not responding	13	12.4
Total institutions	105	100.0%

TABLE 12. Title of Award Recognizing Completion of Two Years of Graduate Study

Title of two-year award	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
Specialist degree	54	44.3%
Certificate	43	35.2
Diploma	11	9.0
Other	14	11.5
Total	122	100.0%
Institutions responding	122	72.6%
Institutions not responding	9	5.4
Institutions without program	37	22.0
Total institutions	168	100.0%

Preservice Programs

The AASA Commission made no effort to describe the typical administrator preparation courses required in universities or colleges. It recognized the wide diversity of course requirements as documented in the literature. Previous status studies encountered problems in analyzing program data collected with an unstructured instrument. The same title may be used for courses with widely different content, and various titles may be used for the same set of experiences. Rather than identifying what others have recognized as the elusive "common core" of subjects or courses in educational administration, that is, those required of all prospective superintendents, the Commission focused instead on shifts in program emphases and on strengths and weaknesses in existing programs.

Earlier studies of preparation programs by Moore, the 1960 AASA Yearbook, and the AASA Committee for the Advancement of School Administration reported the growing trend toward an interdisciplinary approach in administrator preparation programs. CASA declared that the most frequently mentioned major change in preparation programs during the five years prior to 1962-63 was "increased emphasis upon interdisciplinary approach." [6]

The 1969-70 study confirms the propensity to make experiences in disciplines other than education available, recommended, or required in graduate preparation programs for superintendents. As Table 13 shows, the courses and disciplines other than education most likely to be recommended to and/or required of graduate students in administration are in the fields of sociology (65.8 percent of the institutions), statistics (64.5 percent), economics (61.8 percent), political science (61.8 percent), business administration (60.5 percent), and psychology (57.7 percent). Experiences in fields such as anthropology, history, philosophy, law, operations research, and computer technology are more likely to be available but less likely to be recommended or required. Only 40, or less than one-fourth, of the 168 institutions indicated that all 13 disciplines listed in Table 13 were available for graduate study.

Program Additions and Deletions

The free responses to the unstructured questions about new program elements caused problems in the processing and reporting of data. Respondents were asked to indicate additions to their administrator preparation programs since 1960-61. Their responses are summarized in Table 14. More often than not these new developments were one or more specific courses in areas of specialization within the field of educational administration. The varied responses were grouped into 15 special areas. The courses ranged from relatively new areas of inquiry, such as administrative theory, computer sciences, negotiations, systems analysis, and planning and change strategies, to such traditional subject matter as school finance, personnel administration, administration of elementary and secondary schools, public relations, school law, and school plant. Of the 160 institutions responding, 115, or 71.9 percent, added one or more specific courses in administration during the 1960's. Administrative theory courses appear to have been the most likely additions, followed by courses in the computer sciences and school plant. Courses in community college administration, administration of elementary and secondary schools, politics of education, and higher education were added with much less frequency than others.

After course additions, the next most frequently mentioned major change was either establishing or

---

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

TABLE 13. Disciplines Available, Recommended, or Required in Graduate Preparation Programs for Superintendency

Discipline	Institutions where disciplines were					
	Available		Recommended		Required	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Anthropology	87	58.8%	59	39.9%	2	1.4%
Business administration	79	39.5	107	53.5	14	7.0
Economics	78	38.2	113	55.4	13	6.4
Political science	80	38.3	109	52.2	20	9.6
Sociology	74	34.3	111	51.4	31	14.4
Statistics	66	35.5	53	28.5	67	36.0
History	111	61.7	61	33.9	8	4.4
Psychology	82	42.3	73	37.6	39	20.1
Computer technology	81	46.8	80	46.2	12	6.9
Social psychology	77	47.2	77	47.2	9	5.6
Philosophy	89	56.7	45	28.7	23	14.6
Law	50	53.2	30	31.9	14	14.9
Operations research	33	49.3	25	37.3	9	13.4
Other	22	50.0	12	27.3	10	22.7

TABLE 14. Program Elements Added to Preparation of School Administrators Since 1960-61

Program addition	Institutions where highest degree was						Total	
	Master's		Two-year or specialist		Doctorate			
	No.	Percent[a]	No.	Percent[b]	No.	Percent[c]	No.	Percent[d]
One or more specific courses in administration	9	56.3%	31	70.5%	75	75.0%	115	71.9%
Administrative theory	6	66.7	8	25.8	32	42.7	46	40.0
Computer sciences	0	0	8	25.8	28	37.3	36	31.3
School finance	2	22.2	3	9.7	6	8.0	11	9.6
Research	0	0	4	12.9	19	25.3	23	20.0
Administration of elementary and secondary schools	0	0	5	16.1	4	5.3	9	7.8
Personnel administration	3	33.3	12	38.7	10	13.3	25	21.7
Public relations	0	0	10	32.3	6	8.0	16	13.9
School law	2	22.2	5	16.1	8	10.7	15	13.0
Community college administration	0	0	3	9.7	2	2.7	5	4.3
Negotiations	1	11.1	0	0	17	22.7	18	15.7
School plant	4	44.4	18	58.1	12	16.0	34	29.6
Politics of education	0	0	2	6.5	8	10.7	10	8.7
Systems analysis	2	22.2	2	6.5	20	26.7	24	20.9
Planning and change strategies	0	0	5	16.1	8	10.7	13	11.3
Higher education	0	0	2	6.5	10	13.3	12	10.4
Internship	3	18.8	23	52.3	48	48.0	74	46.3
More seminars	2	12.5	9	20.5	30	30.0	41	25.6
Current issues	3	18.8	3	6.8	9	9.0	15	9.4
Interdisciplinary emphasis	0	0	5	11.4	8	8.0	13	8.1
Specialist program begun	1	6.3	4	9.1	4	4.0	9	5.6
Theory of learning or instruction	0	0	3	6.8	5	5.0	8	5.0
Strengthening of requirements	2	12.5	0	0	3	3.0	5	3.1
Other additions	13	81.3	18	40.9	30	30.0	61	38.1
Institutions responding	16	88.9%	44	97.8%	100	95.2%	160	95.2%
Institutions not responding	2	11.1	1	2.2	5	4.8	8	4.8
Total institutions	18	100.0%	45	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%

[a] Based on 16 institutions responding
[b] Based on 44 institutions responding
[c] Based on 100 institutions responding
[d] Based on 160 institutions responding

strengthening the internship program. This ranked as an important element in earlier surveys as well. It appears that program additions during the past decade focused more on specific courses or areas within educational administration than on field experiences or interdisciplinary pursuits. In 1962-63 major revisions of courses ranked number five. Apparently the theory movement hadn't quite caught hold in the early part of the last decade, for the 1962-63 study showed increased emphasis upon theory as ranking twenty-third out of 25 major changes. Only four institutions cited this item as a *major* change. As indicated earlier, administrative theory courses were mentioned by 46, or 40 percent, of those citing specific additions during the 1960's.

More seminars and current issues were the next most frequent new additions to superintendent preparation programs during the 1960's. An interdisciplinary emphasis to the program was ranked fifth in frequency and was registered in 8.1 percent of the institutions. This figure suggests that what was started in the 1950's was fairly well established by the beginning of the 1960's; relatively few institutions made shifts toward an interdisciplinary approach during the last decade.

In general, institutions were more likely to add new program elements than to delete them. Data on deletions are summarized in Table 15. About 29 percent of the institutions indicated no deletions during the 1960's—that is, all program elements offered in 1960-61 continued to be offered in 1969-70. Because courses deleted were often known by a large variety of titles, if all such courses were to be placed in one table, the result would be data difficult to read and comprehend. It can be said that general school administration courses were the most likely to be deleted during the decade. The next most frequently deleted courses were in foundations, curriculum, and related nonadministration courses. About one in eight (12.7 percent) of the institutions deleted supervision courses, particularly separate supervision courses for elementary and secondary schools. Twelve (8.5 percent) of the institutions did not have a preparation program in 1960-61; they should be added to the total of those with no deletions.

Respondents were asked to indicate new program elements that had contributed most to the improvement of preparation for school administrators. The

TABLE 15. Program Elements Deleted from Preparation of School Administrators Since 1960-61

Program deletion	Institutions where highest degree was						Total	
	Master's only		Two-year		Doctoral			
	No.	Percent[a]	No.	Percent[b]	No.	Percent[c]	No.	Percent[d]
Specific courses in school administration	3	20.0%	14	36.8%	45	50.6%	62	43.7%
General school administration	0	0	5	35.7	3	6.7	8	12.9
Principalship (Separate elementary and secondary courses)	0	0	1	7.1	2	4.4	3	4.8
Principalship (Combined elementary and secondary courses)	0	0	1	7.1	0	0	1	1.6
Other specific courses in administration	3	100.0	7	50.0	40	88.9	50	80.6
Supervision courses	1	6.7	6	15.8	11	22.4	18	12.7
Supervision (Separate elementary and secondary courses)	1	100.0	4	66.7	6	54.5	11	61.1
Supervision (One course)	0	0	2	33.3	5	45.4	7	38.9
Foundations, curriculum, and related nonadministration	2	13.3	9	23.7	8	9.0	19	13.4
Preparation program not operating in 1960-61	0	0	6	15.8	6	6.7	12	8.5
Other program deletions	2	13.3	3	7.9	16	18.0	21	14.8
No program deletions	6	40.0	10	26.3	25	28.1	41	28.9
Institutions responding	15	83.3%	38	84.4%	89	84.8%	142	84.5%
Institutions not responding	3	16.7	7	15.6	16	15.2	26	15.5
Total institutions	18	100.0%	45	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%

[a] Based on 15 institutions responding
[b] Based on 38 institutions responding
[c] Based on 89 institutions responding
[d] Based on 142 institutions responding

TABLE 16. New Program Elements Contributing Most to the Improvement of Preparation Programs for School Administrators

Program element	Institutions where highest degree was						Total	
	Master's		Two-year		Doctorate			
	No.	Percent[a]	No.	Percent[b]	No.	Percent[c]	No.	Percent[d]
Specific courses in administration	4	28.6%	8	20.0%	20	20.8%	32	21.3%
School finance and law	4	100.0	4	50.0	4	20.0	12	37.5
Personnel administration and human relations	3	75.0	4	50.0	10	50.0	17	53.1
Negotiation—current issues	0	0	0	0	4	20.0	4	12.5
Simulated materials	0	0	2	25.0	5	25.0	7	21.9
Community college administration	0	0	0	0	4	20.0	4	12.5
Systems analysis	0	0	0	0	6	30.0	6	18.8
Greater use of internships	1	7.1	25	62.5	30	31.3	56	37.3
New degree programs or strengthening of requirements	6	42.8	6	15.0	18	18.8	30	20.0
Theory—more emphasis	0	0	4	10.0	24	25.0	28	18.7
Interdisciplinary emphasis	0	0	4	10.0	14	14.6	18	12.0
More seminars and independent study	1	7.1	4	10.0	13	13.5	18	12.0
Computer science	1	7.1	2	5.0	13	13.5	16	10.7
Research emphasis	0	0	0	0	11	11.5	11	7.3
Behavioral science and sociology offerings	0	0	4	10.0	7	7.3	11	7.3
Improved quality of staff facilities	0	0	0	0	3	3.1	3	2.0
Other courses	2	14.2	6	15.0	10	10.4	18	12.0
No new program elements	1	7.1	2	5.0	5	5.2	8	5.3
Total number of institutions adding new courses	8	57.1%	10	25.0%	26	27.1%	44	29.3%
Institutions responding	14	72.2%	40	88.9%	96	91.4%	150	89.3%
Institutions not responding	4	27.8	5	11.1	9	8.6	18	10.7
Total institutions	18	100.0%	45	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%

[a] Based on 14 institutions responding
[b] Based on 40 institutions responding
[c] Based on 96 institutions responding
[d] Based on 150 institutions responding

TABLE 17. Availability of Administrative Internships

Availability	Institutions where highest degree was							
	Master's		Two-year		Ed.D.		Ph.D.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
No internships available in 1969-70	29	28.2%	13	10.1%	6	7.4%	3	4.5%
Internships available and	74	71.8	116	89.9	75	92.6	64	95.5
Optional	59	79.7	54	46.6	45	60.0	37	57.8
Required	15	20.3	62	53.4	30	40.0	27	42.2
Totals	103	100.0%	129	100.0%	81	100.0%	67	100.0%
Institutions responding	103	61.3%	129	76.8%	81	77.1%	67	63.8%
Institutions not responding	45	26.8	2	1.2	1	1.0	2	1.9
Institutions without internship program	20	11.9	37	22.0	23	21.9	36	34.3
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%	105	100.0%

results are presented in Table 16. Greater use of internships was cited most frequently, followed by specific courses in administration, new degree programs or strengthening of requirements, and finally more emphasis on theory. Among the important specific courses added were those in personnel administration and human relations. Computer science courses in 1969-70 were having relatively little impact; only 10.7 percent of the institutions considered such studies to be contributing significantly to the improvement of preparation programs for school administrators. Although the interdisciplinary approach was considered important, only 7.3 percent of the institutions considered behavioral science and sociology offerings to be contributing the "most" to preparation improvement.

The Administrative Internship

The internship in school administration continued to engender excitement in 1969-70, although it cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered an innovation of the past decade. It was recognized as important to preparation in the 1950's as well. It received special recognition in the 1964 CASA report. Professors in 1969-70 gave it high ranking when talking about major strengths. Where it was not available professors tended to consider its absence a major weakness in the program.

This study sought more detailed information on the availability of and enrollments in administrative internships in 1969-70. As Table 17 shows, internships were not part of the preparation program in 11.9 percent of the institutions with a master's program only, 22 percent of those where the highest degree was the specialist, 21.9 percent of those which awarded a doctor of education degree, and 34.3 percent of those with a Ph.D. program. It can be concluded that a majority of universities and colleges with administrator preparation programs in 1969-70 did provide internship opportunities. Institutions offering advanced graduate study were more likely to have administrative internship slots available in 1969-70 than were others. About 93 percent of the doctoral institutions, almost 19 percent of the two-year degree schools, and almost 72 percent of the master's degree universities and colleges made internships available in 1969-70. Only in the case of institutions granting two-year graduate degrees were the internships more likely to be required than optional. In reading data summarized in Table 17, the distinction should be made between universities and colleges with no internship program at all, those with an internship but with none available in 1969-70 for whatever reason, and those providing internship experiences and with slots available in 1969-70 in cooperating schools.

The internship is by nature an individual experience. The numbers enrolled in internship should not be considered in the same light as enrollments for regular classes. Data on enrollments in administrative internships during 1969-70 are shown in Table 18. In less than one-fourth (23.4 percent) of the institutions, the internship experience was part of the program in 1969-70 but no students were enrolled during that year. Enrollment of less than five was the mode, with 28.5 percent of the institutions reporting such enrollments. Including those with none, it can be said that the majority of the institutions (51.9 percent) in 1969-70 had fewer than five interns. Twenty or more students is a very large internship enrollment. Almost 11 percent of the universities and colleges reported enrollments of that magnitude in 1969-70. The average number enrolled in 1969-70 was 12.3 and the median 7.0. In this case the median would be a better indicator of typical practice than the average.

Major Strengths and Weaknesses

The availability of the administrative internship and high faculty quality were cited most often as major strengths in the superintendency preparation program, followed by quality of the academic program and the employment of special instructional approaches.

In the 1960 AASA Yearbook[7] the following elements were ranked as major strengths:

1. Field experiences (other than internships)
2. Inservice programs for practitioners
3. Superior faculty
4. Internships
5. "Core" programs
6. Good relations with neighboring schools and professional associations
7. Specific courses
8. Seminars.

The CASA study of preparation programs reported the following ranking of major strengths for the year 1962-63:[8]

1. Quality of faculty
2. Interdisciplinary approach
3. Internship and other field experiences
4. Cooperative working relationships with practicing administrators
5. Program flexibility
6. Individual counseling.

Table 13 above confirmed the continuing use of other disciplines in graduate preparation programs for superintendents. However, the interdisciplinary approach was not recognized as a "major strength" in 1969-70. It is evident that elements such as "faculty quality" and "internships" appeared as major strengths in previous studies as well as in 1969-70. The use of unstructured responses makes it difficult to make more precise analyses of relationships among the various studies. It is the Commission's opinion, however, that the major strengths cited in 1969-70 and those reported by earlier researchers did not differ significantly. Data on major strengths are summarized in Table 19.

Turning to the major weaknesses in superintendency preparation programs in 1969-70, the most frequently mentioned was a lack of adequate program offerings, cited by 43.7 percent of the institutions. The three factors next most often cited were bunched close together: low quality of faculty (24.1 percent of the institutions), lack of internship (22.2 percent), and limited financial resources (20.9 percent). Only 3.2 percent of the institutions declared no weaknesses. Items such as inconvenient class scheduling, geographic isolation, and limited enrollment were infrequently mentioned as major weaknesses.

In the 1960 AASA Yearbook the most frequently mentioned weakness was the lack of an internship, followed by inadequate field experiences, program gaps, and numerically inadequate or heavily loaded staff. It is difficult to compare weaknesses reported in various studies because of the unstructured responses, but the weaknesses reported in earlier studies were about the same as those noted in 1969-70. Data on major weaknesses in superintendency preparation programs are summarized in Table 20.

Deterrents to Program Improvement

The major deterrents to improving preparation programs are reported in Table 21. Over three-fourths of the institutions (76.2 percent) singled out "inadequate funds." Surprisingly, the second most frequently mentioned factor was a lack of adequate

---

[7] AASA, *Professional Administrators for America's Schools*, p. 71.

[8] CASA, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

TABLE 18. Enrollment in Administrative Internships

Number enrolled	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
Program offered, but none currently enrolled	32	23.4%
Less than 5	39	28.5
5-9	21	15.3
10-14	16	11.7
15-20	14	10.2
Over 20	15	10.9
Total	137	100.0%
Institutions with internship responding	137	81.5%
Institutions with internship not responding	11	6.5
Total institutions without internship	20	11.9
Total institutions	168	99.9%
Average number enrolled	12.3	
Median number enrolled	7.0	

TABLE 19. Major Strengths in Superintendency Preparation Programs

Strength	Institutions where highest degree offered was						Total	
	Master's		Two-year		Doctorate			
	No.	Percent[a]	No.	Percent[b]	No.	Percent[c]	No.	Percent[d]
Availability of internship program	2	11.8%	22	53.7%	40	39.2%	64	40.0%
High faculty quality	4	23.5	18	43.9	42	41.2	64	40.0
Quality of academic program	2	11.8	13	31.7	44	43.1	59	36.9
Instructional approaches	3	17.6	11	26.8	35	34.3	49	30.6
Quality of facilities or equipment	1	5.9	3	7.3	15	14.7	19	11.9
Breadth of research opportunity	1	5.9	0	0	16	15.7	17	10.6
Convenient class scheduling	3	17.6	5	12.2	7	6.9	15	9.4
Quality of core administrative courses	7	41.2	3	7.3	4	3.9	14	8.8
High quality of students	0	0	0	0	11	10.8	11	6.9
Close relationship to public schools and districts	1	5.9	5	12.2	5	4.9	11	6.9
Proximity to population centers	0	0	2	4.9	2	2.0	4	2.5
Enrollment	0	0	3	7.3	1	1.0	4	2.5
Financial soundness	0	0	0	0	2	2.0	2	1.3
Other strengths	0	0	1	2.4	4	4.0	5	3.1
No strengths	0	0	1	2.4	0	0	1	0.6
Institutions responding	17	94.4%	41	91.1%	102	97.1%	160	95.2%
Institutions not responding	1	5.6	4	8.9	3	2.9	8	4.8
Total institutions	18	100.0%	45	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%

[a] Based on 17 institutions responding
[b] Based on 41 institutions responding
[c] Based on 102 institutions responding
[d] Based on 160 institutions responding

secretarial staff, reported by 30.4 percent of the institutions. Professors must be facing greater correspondence and professional writing demands which call for more adequate secretarial assistance. Inadequate opportunities for research, shortage of desirable facilities, and shortage of high quality staff members were each mentioned by approximately one-fourth of the institutions. Ranking number six

TABLE 20. Major Weaknesses in Superintendency Preparation Programs

Weakness	Institutions where highest degree offered was						Total	
	Master's		Two-year		Doctorate			
	No.	Percent[a]	No.	Percent[b]	No.	Percent[c]	No.	Percent[d]
Lack of adequate offerings	15	93.8%	24	60.0%	30	29.4%	69	43.7%
Low quality faculty	2	12.5	6	15.0	30	29.4	38	24.1
Lack of internship	1	6.3	7	17.5	27	26.5	35	22.2
Limited financial resources	0	0	9	22.5	24	23.5	33	20.9
Not enough top students	1	6.3	6	15.0	13	12.7	20	12.7
Inadequate facilities or equipment	1	6.3	5	12.5	9	8.8	15	9.5
Inconvenient class scheduling	0	0	1	2.5	5	4.9	6	3.8
Geographic isolation	0	0	1	2.5	5	4.9	6	3.8
Limited enrollments	1	6.3	1	2.5	2	2.0	4	2.5
Others	1	6.3	2	5.0	10	9.8	13	8.2
No weaknesses	0	0	1	2.5	4	3.9	5	3.2
Institutions responding	16	88.9%	40	88.9%	102	97.1%	158	94.0%
Institutions not responding	2	11.1	5	11.1	3	2.9	10	6.0
Total institutions	18	100.0%	45	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%

[a] Based on 16 institutions responding
[b] Based on 40 institutions responding
[c] Based on 102 institutions responding
[d] Based on 158 institutions responding

TABLE 21. Deterrents to Improving Preparation Programs for Superintendents

Deterrent	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
Inadequate funds	128	76.2%
Lack of adequate secretarial staff	51	30.4
Inadequate opportunities for research	45	26.8
Shortage of desirable facilities	45	26.8
Shortage of high quality staff	42	25.0
Inadequate offerings in related subject fields	35	20.8
Inadequate opportunities for field service	30	17.9
Not enough high quality students attracted	29	17.3
Resistance of professional staff	25	14.9
Lack of desirable relations with local school systems	15	8.9
Others	33	19.6
Total institutions responding	168	100.0%

were inadequate offerings in related subject fields. Approximately one in five institutions felt this to be a major deterrent. "Not enough high quality students attracted" was indicated by 17.3 percent of the institutions. Relatively few (less than 10 percent) of the institutions were of the opinion that a lack of desirable working relationships with local school systems was a major deterrent.

In the 1958-59 and 1962-63 studies inadequate funding was by far the most frequently mentioned deterrent to program improvement. Inadequate opportunities for research, shortage of adequate facilities, shortage of qualified personnel, and lack of qualified students followed close behind. At the bottom of the list of deterrents in previous studies was the lack of close working relationships with school systems. It can be concluded that the deterrents recognized in 1969-70 were very similar to those reported in earlier research.

Thus, over the past 10 to 15 years there has been agreement among professors as to what constitute major strengths, major weaknesses, and major deterrents to the improvement of preparation programs for school superintendents. Unfortunately, this agreement has not been translated into strategies that would enable institutions of higher learning to overcome problems and to capitalize on strengths.

Inservice Programs for Superintendents

Most institutions of higher learning accept responsibilities for preservice preparation leading to certification and employment in administration. Less well defined are institutional responsibilities for the *continuing* professional development of superintendents. Tables 22-26 document what institutions of higher learning are doing for inservice education of administrators. They do not indicate what state and national professional societies are doing in this area. Efforts by these groups are relatively recent. To illustrate, the AASA National Academy for School Executives, an organization dedicated specifically to the continuing professional development of school superintendents in the United States, came into being late in 1968 with program operations on a sizable scale beginning in 1969.

AASA appointed a special Commission on Inservice Education for School Administration which reported to the profession in 1963.[9] This Commission emphasized the urgency and importance of inservice education and declared that institutions of higher learning should begin to furnish leadership in providing such services. It called for greater investments on the part of universities and colleges in such programs.

Table 22 indicates that one-fourth (25.3 percent) of the institutions responding reported no inservice programs for superintendents. Table 23 shows that most of the universities that did sponsor such programs operated no more than two administrator conferences per year. Surprisingly enough, 13 universities reported convening six or more conferences per year.

Three-fourths of the institutions convening administrator conferences indicated that a typical conference was likely to be from one to three days long. Less than four in ten (38.7 percent) sponsored one-day conferences. Less than one in two (46.2 percent) convened conferences of two or three days in length, which was the modal time span. These data are organized in Table 24.

Superintendent conferences sponsored by institutions of higher learning were not large. Over one-half (53.6 percent) of the institutions reported an average attendance of less than 50. The median number in attendance, as shown in Table 25, was about 47, although the average was about 57. Less than one-fourth (23.2 percent) reported 100 or more superintendents in attendance.

It can be concluded that about one-fourth of the institutions of higher learning offered no inservice programs for superintendents, while the remainder provided relatively limited experiences. Most administrator conferences were relatively short—no more than three days—and were attended by fewer than 50 school administrators.

---

[9] AASA. *Inservice Education for School Administration.* A Report of the AASA Commission on Inservice Education for School Administration. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1963. 208 pp.

In most cases graduate credit could be earned for attending such administrator inservice programs. Data on credits are summarized in Table 26. Typically between two and three quarter hours of credit could be earned by superintendents attending such programs.

TABLE 22. Inservice Programs for Superintendents Sponsored by Institutions of Higher Learning

Number of programs	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
None	42	25.3%
1 or more	124	74.7
Total	166	100.0%
Institutions responding	166	99.0%
Institutions not responding	2	1.0
Total institutions	168	100.0%

TABLE 23. School Administrator Conferences Sponsored by Institutions of Higher Learning

Number of conferences	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
None	41	25.3%
1–2	77	47.[illegible]
3–5	31	19.1
6 or more	13	8.0
Total	162	99.9%
Institutions responding	162	96.2%
Institutions not responding	6	3.8
Total institutions	168	100.0%

TABLE 24. Length of School Administrator Conferences

Length	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
1 day	46	38.7%
2–3 days	55	46.2
4 or more days	18	15.1
Total	119	100.0%
Institutions responding	119	70.8%
Institutions not responding	49	29.2
Total institutions	168	100.0%

TABLE 25. Number of Superintendents Attending Inservice Conferences

Number in attendance	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
1-24	19	17.0%
25-49	41	36.6
50-74	22	19.6
75-99	4	3.6
100 or more	26	23.2
Total	112	100.0%
Institutions responding	112	66.7
Institutions not responding	17	10.1
Institutions with no inservice program	39	23.2
Total institutions	168	100.0%
Average number attending	57.4	
Median number attending	46.9	

TABLE 26. Amount of Graduate Credit Carried by Inservice Education Programs for Superintendents

Credit in quarter hours	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
None	10	13.3%
One	12	16.0
Two	22	29.3
Three	28	37.3
Four	3	4.0
Five	0	0
Total	75	99.9%
Institutions responding	75	44.6%
Institutions not responding	54	32.1
Institutions without program	39	23.2
Total institutions	168	99.9%
Average credit in quarter hours	2.3[a] 2.0[b]	
Median credit in quarter hours	2.0[a] 1.7[b]	

[a] "No credit" category exclnded in computation
[b] "No credit" category included in computation

Superintendents' Appraisal of Graduate Study Programs

The 1969-70 AASA survey of school superintendents asked them to appraise their preparation programs.[10] By and large most perceived their graduate study as relevant and as a major source of strength in performing professional responsibilities. A similar reaction was obtained in the 1958-59 survey.

At least three-fourths of the superintendents ranked educational administration courses such as school finance and personnel administration as being of importance or great importance to them. A similarly high ranking was given to field experiences and to courses in other disciplines such as economics and political science. Only a little over one-third of the superintendents recognized sociology as being of importance. They voiced mixed reactions to courses in education foundations, curriculum and instruction, and supervision. They tended to feel the more established courses were of greater importance than the relatively new "technology" courses in administration.

---

[10] AASA Commission on the Preparation of Professional School Administrators. *The American School Superintendent.* (Edited by S. J. Knezevich.) Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1971. pp. 50-52.

The superintendents assessed as major weaknesses in graduate programs such factors as poor or irrelevant course offerings in general, poor quality of specific educational administration courses, and low quality of professors. As major strengths in graduate studies superintendents most often cited the quality of educational administration courses and the high quality of professors. Once again, unstructured responses made comparisons with previous studies difficult.

In a 1969 study the University Council in Educational Administration (UCEA) obtained reactions of superintendents to preparation programs.[11] The UCEA's unstructured questionnaire was mailed to those superintendents who had received a doctorate from any of the 46 UCEA member institutions. This highly selective and unstratified sample yielded responses from 180 superintendents. In the AASA sample of over 800, stratified by size of district, respondents were selected without regard to institutions where their degrees were earned. The AASA employed, by and large, a structured data-gathering instrument. Conclusions reported in the UCEA and the AASA studies were similar. The UCEA reported that superintendents were favorably disposed toward programs but retained a high degree of critical objectivity. They mentioned most frequently as major strengths of graduate study the interdisciplinary nature of the program content, the conceptual or theoretical characteristics of the content, the extent to which the content was relevant to practice, and the variety or breadth of content.[12] There was far more muted praise for the interdisciplinary and theoretical nature of the content from superintendents in the AASA study, most of whom did not hold a doctorate.

The UCEA study permitted the following generalizations regarding program:

1. There is an established trend in program content toward the incorporation of theoretical, conceptual, and research-related material drawn from the social and behavioral sciences and to a lesser extent from business and public administration.
2. There is a need to achieve a greater relevance in the application of "external' content to the skills required and the problems confronted by practicing educational administrators.
3. There is an emergent trend in program content toward according increased attention to topics dealing with contemporary problems and new skills needed in school administration.
4. There are needs for, and established trends toward, greater flexibility and increased internal structure in preparatory programs.
5. Implicit in the above trends and needs are a need for, and an emergent trend toward, the achievement of improved balance between flexibility and structure within preparation programs.
6. With regard to external structural arrangements, there is a need for, and a trend toward, improving working relations between departments of educational administration and university divisions outside the school of education.[13]

In general it can be said that preparation programs for school administrators were not static during the 1960's. Many significant changes occurred in courses and field experiences available. At the beginning of the decade relatively few institutions offered courses in administrative theory. Both the present study and the one completed by UCEA in 1969 recorded the fact that courses in administrative theory were well established by the end of the decade. It should be noted that subject matter related to the "new technology" at the end of the 1960's was moving about as rapidly as administrative theory had been at the beginning of the period. There appeared to be greater emphasis on the computer sciences than on systems analysis per se (PPBS, network modeling, and quantitative analysis techniques). The incorporation of new subject matter appears to take a period of at least 10 years.

Summary

Publicly supported institutions of higher learning were more likely to offer two-year programs of graduate study than were the privately endowed. Most universities provided opportunities to pursue either a two-year program of study or a doctorate. Only about one-third of the universities allowed graduate credits earned toward the specialist degree to be applied toward an Ed.D. or Ph.D. Completion of a two-year graduate study program was most likely to be recognized by a "specialist" degree; the next most popular designation was "certificate" of graduate study.

Less than one-fourth of the institutions provided a full range of disciplines outside the field of education for graduate study programs for the superintendency. Sociology, statistics, political science, economics, business administration, and psychology were the outside disciplines most likely to be recommended or required. History, anthropology, philosophy, law, and operations research were more likely to be designated as optional than as recommended or required fields of study. The interdisciplinary approach to education appeared to be well accepted and practiced in universities and colleges with graduate programs in educational administration in 1969-70.

---

[11] Culbertson, Jack, *et al. Preparing Education Leaders for the '70's*. Final Report, Project #8-0230. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, December 1969. 568 pp. (Mimeo.)

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 400.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 492-93.

New program elements were more likely to be specific courses in administration than anything else. Courses related to administrative theory were added more often than any other new studies. The administrative theory movement, which data collected in 1962-63 indicated was proceeding at a relatively slow pace, gathered strength during the remainder of the 1960's and appeared to be a well established part of superintendency preparation programs by 1969-70. The administrative internship was the next most frequently mentioned new program element in 1969-70. It too was a part of some programs before 1960.

Program elements were deleted as well as added during the decade, although far less frequently. Specific courses in school administration were the most frequently deleted, followed by those in foundations, curriculum, and supervision. In general it was difficult to compare data compiled in 1969-70 with data from previous studies because of the unstructured nature of the responses.

The new program elements that were considered to have contributed the most to the improvement of the preparation program for school administrators were specific courses in administration, the greater use of the administrative internship, the strengthening of requirements, and the emphasis on theory.

The administrative internship ranked as an important program element in all previous studies as well. About 88 percent of the institutions of higher learning had internship programs in 1969-70. Internships were more likely to be required at the two-year and doctoral levels than at the master's level. The typical institution had approximately seven persons enrolled in the internship. Less than one-fourth (23.4 percent) of the institutions offered the program but had no one currently enrolled.

The major strengths and weaknesses of administrator preparation programs reported in 1969-70 were very similar to those noted in previous studies. The most frequently mentioned were the availability of internships and high quality of faculty, followed closely by the quality of the academic program and the types of instructional approaches used. The major weaknesses appeared to be the lack of adequate offerings, low quality of faculty, lack of internship, and limited financial resources.

The major deterrent to improvement once again was inadequate funds. For the first time a lack of adequate secretarial staff was mentioned often. Previous studies reported inadequate opportunities for research, shortage of desirable facilities, and shortage of high quality staff as major deterrents to program improvement.

The 1969-70 data once again allowed the conclusion that institutions of higher learning were concerned far more with preservice education than with the continuing professional development of the superintendent. Only three-fourths of the responding institutions with preservice programs offered any kind of inservice program during the year for superintendents. Typically relatively few programs were offered. They were of short duration and were attended by less than 50 administrators. Graduate credit was available for those attending administrative conferences.

Data from recent UCEA and AASA surveys of superintendents show that most perceived their graduate study as relevant and as a major source of strength in executing their professional responsibilities.

Chapter 5

Graduate Programs: Academic and Financial Dimensions

The states vary considerably in their requirements for school administrator certification, but most demand at least five years of study. A growing number of states are demanding six years of preparation for a superintendent's certificate. Emphasis to date has been upon graduate level training of at least one year rather than upon a relatively diverse undergraduate education.

Those who present themselves for graduate study in educational administration must meet certain standards for admission. Following admission they must meet specific sets of requirements for completion of a degree. These may include a period of continuous residency, written and oral tests, language competency, and a thesis.

The pursuit of graduate study also calls for financial expenditures on the part of the student for tuition and other costs. As we shall see later in this chapter, aid in the form of scholarships, assistantships, and fellowships may or may not be available to graduate students.

Admission Standards and Student Selection Procedures

A variety of demands are made upon those seeking admission to graduate study in educational administration. It would be erroneous to conclude, as some have suggested, that a simple self-selection process prevails. This assumes that a student decides to become an administrator, presents himself at an institution of higher learning, is admitted to a training program without further ado, and then is employed as a superintendent.

The present AASA study made no effort to collect data on the recruitment of students for administrator preparation programs. Little is known about strategies for attracting students into educational administration. What motivates a person to pursue graduate study in administration is worthy of additional research.

In 1969 the UCEA submitted recommendations on recruitment of students for new graduate programs in educational administration, calling for greater concentration on the noncognitive aspect of leadership, identification of specific situational interaction indicators of stable behavior, special efforts to identify and recruit outstanding potential leaders from among minority groups, special arrangements for identifying and recruiting prospective education leaders from among undergraduate college populations, and a greater allocation of resources and staff effort to recruitment during the 1970's.[1] The UCEA recognized the lack of systematic and aggressive efforts by institutions of higher learning to recruit talented persons to administrative preparation programs. It urged expansion of the traditional recruitment pool for candidates for advanced preparation, involvement of practicing administrators in recruiting candidates for doctoral programs, and increased financial assistance to students being recruited.

The present AASA study focused on those who present themselves, for whatever reasons, for admission to graduate study and gathered data on what was demanded of them prior to and following admission. Typical requirements in 1969-70 included written letters of recommendation, standardized test scores, character references, undergraduate transcripts, and sometimes oral examinations or interviews. Data on the variety of admission requirements for graduate students seeking acceptance to school superintendency programs are summarized in Table 27. They suggest that admission to doctoral level work was most likely to demand submission of letters of recommendation, specified test scores, and oral exams or interviews. Over 96 percent of the institutions responding required applicants for admission to Ed.D. degree programs to submit letters of recommendation. Over 91 percent required applicants for admission to Ph.D. programs to submit such letters. Oral interviews or exams, in contrast, were part of the admission sequence in only about two-thirds of the institutions granting doctor's degrees. Completion of specified undergraduate courses was less likely to be a factor at the doctoral level than at the master's level. There appeared to be no significant change in the general admission requirements from 1958-59 to 1962-63 to 1969-70.

Tests

Asked to name the tests used in determining admission to administrator preparation programs, most

---

[1] Culbertson, Jack, *et al. Preparing Education Leaders for the '70's.* Final Report, Project #8-0230. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, December 1969. 568 pp. (Mimeo.)

TABLE 27. Admission Requirements for Graduate Preparation for Superintendency

Requirement	Institutions with given requirement for admission to							
	Master's		Two-year		Ed.D.		Ph.D.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Written letters of recommendation	85	72.6%	109	87.2%	74	96.1%	62	91.2%
Standardized tests	91	77.8	100	80.0	66	85.7	60	88.2
Character references	75	64.1	90	72.0	55	71.4	44	64.7
Completion of specific undergraduate courses	87	74.4	74	59.2	42	54.5	32	47.1
Oral exam or interview	33	28.2	74	59.2	52	67.5	46	67.6
Totals	117	100.0%	125	100.0%	77	100.0%	68	100.0%
Institutions responding	117	69.6	125	74.4	77	73.3	68	64.8
Institutions not responding	31	18.5	6	3.6	5	4.8	1	1.0
Institutions without program	20	11.9	37	22.0	23	21.9	36	34.3
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%	105	100.0%

TABLE 28. Tests Used in Determining Admission to Administrator Preparation Programs

Test	Institutions using test		Institutions specifying cutoff scores		Institutions not specifying cutoff scores	
	No.	Percent[a]	No.	Percent[b]	No.	Percent[b]
Graduate Record Examination	126	82.9%	75	59.5%	51	40.5%
Miller Analogies Text	86	56.6	45	52.3	41	47.7
Cooperative English Test	12	7.9	1	8.3	11	91.7
Watson-Glaser Test of Critical Thinking	9	5.9	0	0	9	100.0
English Usage on Writing Proficiency	5	3.3	1	20.0	4	80.0
National Teachers Examination	7	4.6	6	85.7	1	14.3
Others	24	5.8	6	25.0	18	75.0
Institutions responding	152	90.5%				
Institutions not responding	11	6.5				
Institutions without test requirement	5	3.0				
Total institutions	168	100.0%				

[a] Percent computed on basis of 152 institutions responding
[b] Percent based on numbers using test

respondents cited the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) and the Miller Analogies Test (MAT). As indicated in Table 28, almost 83 percent of the institutions responding used the GRE, and almost 57 percent used the MAT. The next most frequently used testing instrument was the Cooperative English Test, but less than 8 percent of the institutions employed it.

These tests may be used for a variety of purposes, such as for counseling to determine the candidates' strengths and weaknesses in tailoring a special program for their professional development, or for predicting future success in academic study or administrative performance. They have been used most successfully, within specified margins of error, to predict academic success. Here the record at the undergraduate level is better than at the graduate level. So far tests and other indicators have been unable to predict successful administrative performance with a high degree of accuracy.

Both the GRE and the MAT are recognized as indicators of certain kinds of intellectual capabilities. They do not measure factors outside the cognitive domain. For all their limitations, these testing instruments were employed, either jointly or separately, by a majority of universities in 1969-70 as the best indicators of success in graduate programs in educational administration.

Not all institutions that employed the GRE or the MAT interpreted the results the same way or utilized them for the same purposes. The majority of the institutions using such instruments did specify cutoff scores for both the GRE and the MAT. The precise cutoff score varied among institutions and within institutions for different levels of graduate study. Students were expected to reach a specified score and were informed that failing to do so could be injurious to their acceptance as graduate students. Table 28 shows that 59.5 percent and 52.3 percent of the institutions specified a cutoff score for the GRE and the MAT, respectively.

Studies of data gathered in 1958-59 and 1962-63 likewise reported that more reliance was placed on the GRE and the MAT than on any other instruments, that different cutoff scores for admission were specified, and that some institutions had no cutoff scores. In general, there appeared to be no breakthroughs in the use of general or specific tests for admission to graduate programs in educational administration during the 1960's.

Grade Point Averages

Previously earned grade point average, at the undergraduate and/or graduate level, was also a factor considered in the admission of students to administrator preparation programs in 1969-70. Data on required undergraduate averages are summarized in Table 29. The equivalent of a B average, or 3.0 on a 4-point scale, was the median and modal grade point average required for admission to advanced graduate work at the two-year or doctoral level. A lower grade point average (2.7) was typically demanded for entrance into the master's degree stream. Graduate grade point averages demanded for admission to graduate study are summarized in Table 30. The highest averages were demanded at the doctoral level.

Age

Relatively few institutions listed a maximum or minimum age requirement for admission to graduate preparation programs for the superintendency. If no response is interpreted to mean no maximum age for admission to graduate study, then most institutions had no such age constraints. Analysis of the limited number of responses suggests no maximum age cutoff in at least 70 percent of the institutions for those desiring to pursue a master's or two-year program. However, there did appear to be a maximum age beyond which students were not admitted to doctoral study. Admission constraints began to be recorded after age 40. The data would imply that the majority of institutions did not accept new doctoral candidates over the age of 45. The median maximum age for doctoral candidates appeared to be about 46. These data appear in Table 31.

TABLE 29. Minimum Undergraduate Grade Point Averages for Admission to Graduate Preparation for Superintendency

Grade point average required (4-point scale)	Institutions with undergraduate GPA requirement for admission to							
	Master's		Two-year		Ed.D.		Ph.D.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
None	1	1.0%	0	0 %	1	2.5%	1	2.4%
2.0—2.49	13	12.6	3	4.5	1	2.5	0	0
2.5	33	32.0	16	23.9	3	7.5	5	12.2
2.51—2.74	8	7.8	4	6.0	2	5.0	5	12.2
2.75—2.99	16	15.5	10	14.9	3	6.5	4	9.8
3.0	28	27.2	29	43.3	26	65.0	24	58.5
3.1—3.5	4	3.9	5	7.5	4	10.0	2	4.9
Totals	103	100.0%	67	100.1%	40	99.0%	41	100.0%
Institutions responding	103	61.3%	67	39.9%	40	38.1%	41	39.0%
Institutions not responding	45	26.8	64	38.1	42	40.0	28	26.7
Institutions with no program	20	11.9	37	22.0	23	21.9	36	34.3
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%	105	100.0%
Mean grade point average required	2.7		2.8		2.9		2.8	
Median grade point average required	2.7		3.0		3.0		3.0	
Modal grade point average required	2.5		3.0		3.0		3.0	

Experience

Table 32 summarizes teaching experience required for admittance to preparation programs for the school superintendency. Relatively few institutions did not demand teaching experience prior to entry into such programs. Admission to the master's degree stream was least likely to require teaching experience, but even at this level seven schools out of eight required teaching experience. Most institutions (about 70 percent) demanded two or three years of teaching experience. Five years appeared to be the maximum number required.

Administrative experience prior to admission to master's degree programs was not required by 86.4 percent of the institutions, but was demanded for admission at the doctoral level by more than 75 percent. The general practice was to demand about two years of administrative experience for admission to doctoral level programs. Very few institutions demanded more than three years of administrative experience. These data are organized in Table 33.

In general, teaching and administrative experience requirements for admission to administrator preparation in 1958-59 and 1962-63 had not changed very much by 1969-70. There may be less specification of either teaching or administrative experience in the future, however, if the arguments for expanding the talent pool to include persons outside the field of education gain strength. Likewise, certification trends calling for more graduate school preparation prior to entry into the practice of administration may force removal of the requirement for prior administrative experience (which could be gained only with a certificate in hand, which in turn demands graduate study). The internship or other field experience may have to be substituted for administrative experience demands for admission to graduate study. No discernible trends could be read from the data compiled in 1969-70 to suggest that less reliance was being placed on prior administrative experience. There is a body of literature in the field calling for such changes, however.

Degree Requirements

Residency

The 1960 AASA Yearbook reported that full-time study in preparation programs for the superintendency was relatively rare in 1958-59. In 1962-63 data collected by the AASA Committee for the Advancement of School Administration showed approximately seven full-time students in residence per institution. CASA found that there were institutions of higher learning which required no period of full-time residence from their graduate students in educational administration.

Full-time continuous residence requirements in 1969-70 are summarized in Table 34. Residency during at least one summer session is demanded by almost one-third (32.8 percent) of the institutions at

TABLE 30. Minimum Graduate Grade Point Averages for Admission to Advanced Graduate Preparation for Superintendency

Grade point average required (4-point scale)	Institutions with graduate GPA requirement for admission to							
	Master's		Two-year		Ed.D.		Ph.D.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
None	1	1.8%	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %
Up to 2.49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.5–2.74	5	8.8	3	3.6	1	1.8	1	2.4
2.75–2.99	4	7.0	3	3.6	0	0	0	0
3.0	37	64.9	39	46.4	23	41.8	16	38.1
3.1–3.49	5	8.8	29	34.5	10	18.2	8	19.0
3.5[a]	5	8.8	10	11.9	21	38.2	17	40.5
Total	57	100.1%	84	100.0%	55	100.0%	42	100.0%
Institutions responding	57	33.9%	84	50.0%	55	52.4%	42	40.0%
Institutions not responding	91	54.2	47	28.0	27	25.7	27	25.7
Institutions without program	20	11.9	37	22.0	23	21.9	36	34.3
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%	105	100.0%
Mean grade point average required	3.0		3.2		3.2		3.3	
Median grade point average required	3.0		3.0		3.2		3.3	
Modal grade point average required	3.0		3.0		3.0		3.5	

[a] No institution required a grade point average higher than 3.5.

TABLE 31. Maximum Age for Admission to Graduate Preparation Programs for Superintendency

Maximum age bracket	Institutions with maximum age for admission to							
	Master's		Two-year		Ed.D.		Ph.D.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
No maximum age required	9	75.0%	7	70.0%	3	27.3%	4	30.8%
Under 40 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40-44	0	0	0	0	2	18.2	3	23.1
45-49	2	16.7	2	20.0	4	36.4	4	30.8
50-54	1	8.3	1	10.0	2	18.2	2	15.4
55 and over	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	12	100.0%	10	100.0%	11	100.1%	13	100.1%
Institutions responding	12	7.1%	10	6.0%	11	10.5%	13	12.4%
Institutions not responding	136	81.0	121	72.0	71	67.6	56	53.3
Institutions without program	20	11.9	37	22.0	23	21.9	36	34.3
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%	105	100.0%
Average maximum age bracket[a]	48.7		47.8		47.0		46.4	
Median maximum age bracket[a]	49		49		47.1		46.5	

[a] "No maximum age required" category excluded in computation

TABLE 32. Teaching Experience Required for Admission to Graduate Preparation Programs for Superintendency

Teaching experience required, in years	Institutions requiring teaching experience for admission to							
	Master's		Two-year		Ed.D.		Ph.D.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
None	9	12.5%	2	2.5%	2	4.5%	2	5.4%
1	12	16.7	11	13.9	3	6.8	5	13.5
2	22	30.6	19	24.1	14	31.8	10	27.0
3	23	31.9	39	49.4	21	47.7	16	43.2
4	1	1.4	2	2.5	2	4.5	3	8.1
5	5	6.9	6	7.6	2	4.5	1	2.7
Total	72	100.0%	79	100.0%	44	99.8%	37	99.9%
Institutions responding	72	42.9%	79	47.0%	44	41.9%	37	35.2%
Institutions not responding	76	45.2	57	31.0	38	36.2	36	34.3
Institutions without program	20	11.9	37	22.0	23	21.9	32	30.5
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%	105	100.0%
Average number of years required	2.5[a] 2.2[b]		2.7[a] 2.6[b]		2.7[a] 2.6[b]		2.6[a] 2.4[b]	
Median number of years required	1.9[a] 1.7[b]		2.2[a] 2.2[b]		2.2[a] 2.2[b]		2.2[a] 2.1[b]	

[a] "No experience required" category excluded in computation
[b] "No experience required" category included in computation

the master's level and almost one-fourth (24.6 percent) at the two-year or specialist degree level.

No residency was demanded of students in administrator preparation programs in over one-third (36.7

TABLE 33. Administrative Experience Required for Admission to Graduate Preparation Programs for Superintendency

Administrative experience required, in years	Institutions requiring administrative experience for admission to							
	Master's		Two-year		Ed.D.		Ph.D.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
None	19	86.4%	12	42.9%	6	24.0%	4	21.1%
1	0	0	5	17.9	4	16.0	4	21.1
2	0	0	3	10.7	10	40.0	8	42.1
3	3	13.6	6	21.4	5	20.0	2	10.5
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.3
5 or more	0	0	2	7.1	0	0	0	0
Total	22	100.0%	28	100.0%	25	100.0%	19	100.0%
Institutions responding	22	13.1%	28	16.7%	25	23.8%	19	18.1%
Institutions not responding	126	75.0	103	61.3	57	54.3	50	47.6
Institutions without program	20	11.9	37	22.0	23	21.9	36	34.3
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%	105	100.0%
Average number of years required	3.0[a] 0.4[b]		2.5[a] 1.4[b]		2.1[a] 1.6[b]		2.0[a] 1.6[b]	
Median number of years required	3.0[a] 0[b]		2.1[a] 0[b]		1.6[a] 1.3[b]		1.5[a] 1.3[b]	

[a] "No experience required" category excluded in computation
[b] "No experience required" category included in computation

TABLE 34. Full-Time Continuous Residence Requirements for Degree Programs in Educational Administration

Length of residence required	Institutions requiring residence for							
	Master's		Two-year		Ed.D.		Ph.D.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
One summer session (6, 8, or 10 weeks)	42	32.8%	32	24.6%	0	0 %	0	0 %
One term other than summer (quarter, trimester, semester)	31	24.2	62	27.7	5	6.2	3	4.3
1 or 2 years	8	6.3	11	8.5	76	93.8	66	95.7
None	47	36.7	25	19.2	0	0	0	0
Total	128	100.0%	130	100.0%	81	100.0%	69	100.0%
Institutions responding	128	76.2%	130	77.4%	81	77.1%	69	65.7%
Institutions not responding	20	11.9	1	0.6	1	1.0	0	0
Institutions without program	20	11.9	37	22.0	23	21.9	36	34.3
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%	105	100.0%

percent) of the institutions at the master's level and in almost one out of five (19.2 percent) at the two-year or specialist degree level.

All institutions specified a period of residence for doctoral candidates in educational administration, usually at least one year. It was the rare institution that required as little as one term, such as a quarter, trimester, or semester, of residence for the doctoral degree. Table 34 shows that only 6.2 percent of the institutions awarding an Ed.D. degree and 4.3 percent of those granting a Ph.D. required as little as one term of cotinuous residence. The recommendations in the 1960 AASA Yearbook and those of the AASA Committee for the Advancement of School

Administration appeared to bring about significant changes in graduate school residence requirements during the 1960's. It can be said that graduate study residence requirements in degree programs in educational administration, particularly at the doctoral level, were more stringent in 1969-70 than at any previous time.

Foreign Language, Thesis, Examinations

In addition to residence and completion of a given pattern of courses, some graduate students in educational administration in 1969-70 were required to gain competency in a foreign language, complete a thesis, obtain a satisfactory score on a written examination, and meet approved standards on an oral examination. Data on these requirements are summarized in Table 35. In general, it can be said that mastery of one or more foreign languages was *not* likely to be demanded of graduate students pursuing the master's or two-year degree. Only 2.4 percent of the institutions awarding an Ed.D. and 60.9 percent of those granting a Ph.D. required demonstration of competency in a foreign language. Competency in one or more foreign languages was less of a barrier to completion of post-graduate education in educational administration in 1969-70 than at any previous time.

Completion of a thesis was demanded in practically all doctoral programs, in over a third (37.4 percent) of the two-year programs, and in less than one in ten (9.9 percent) of the master's degree programs. More than seven out of ten (71.5 percent) of the universities held the master's degree thesis to be optional, rather than required or not required.

Written examinations still prevailed as common practice in the majority of institutions at all graduate levels. They were required by more than 96 percent at the doctoral level, by 62 percent at the two-year level, and by 56.3 percent at the master's level.

Oral examinations likewise were found most frequently at the doctoral level; approximately 94 percent of the universities demanded such examinations, as compared to 61.2 percent at the two-year level and only 34.9 percent at the master's level. The large numbers of students completing master's degrees in educational administration may be one major reason for the declining number of institutions demanding oral examinations at this level.

In summary, it can be concluded that at the master's degree level competency in a foreign language and completion of a thesis were not likely to be required for candidates in school administration, oral examinations were somewhat more likely to be required, and written exams were required in the majority of the institutions.

TABLE 35. Institutional Requirements for Completion of Graduate Preparation Programs for Superintendency

Degree requirement	Institutions where foreign language competence, thesis, written examination, or oral examination was						Totals		Total institutions responding		Total institutions not responding		Total institutions without program		Total institutions	
	Not required		Optional		Required											
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Foreign language competence																
Master's	107	82.9%	21	16.3%	1	0.8%	129	100.0%	129	76.8%	19	11.3%	20	11.9%	168	100.0%
Two-year	99	86.7	15	13.2	0	0	114	100.0	114	67.9	17	10.1	37	22.0	168	100.0
Doctorate																
Ed.D.	56	68.3	24	29.3	2	2.4	82	100.0	82	78.1	0	0	23	21.9	105	100.0
Ph.D.	8	11.6	19	27.5	42	60.9	69	100.0	69	65.7	0	0	36	34.3	105	100.0
Thesis																
Master's	26	18.4	101	71.5	14	9.9	141	99.9	141	83.9	7	4.2	20	11.9	168	100.0
Two-year	48	41.7	24	20.9	43	37.4	115	100.0	115	68.5	16	9.5	37	22.0	168	100.0
Doctorate																
Ed.D.	1	1.3	1	1.3	78	97.5	80	100.1	80	76.2	2	1.9	23	21.9	105	100.0
Ph.D.	1	1.4	1	1.4	67	97.1	69	99.9	69	65.7	0	0	36	34.3	105	100.0
Written examination																
Master's	34	25.2	25	18.5	76	56.3	135	100.0	135	80.4	13	7.7	20	11.9	168	100.0
Two-year	21	19.4	20	18.5	67	62.0	108	99.9	108	64.3	23	13.7	37	22.0	168	100.0
Doctorate																
Ed.D.	1	1.3	2	2.6	75	96.2	78	100.0	78	74.3	4	3.8	23	21.9	105	100.0
Ph.D.	0	0	1	1.5	67	98.5	68	100.0	68	64.8	1	1.0	36	34.3	105	100.1
Oral examination																
Master's	47	37.3	35	27.8	44	34.9	126	100.0	126	75.0	22	13.1	20	11.9	168	100.0
Two-year	28	24.1	17	14.7	71	61.2	116	100.0	116	69.0	15	8.9	37	22.0	168	99.9
Doctorate																
Ed.D.	2	2.5	3	3.7	76	93.8	81	100.0	81	77.1	1	1.0	23	21.9	105	100.0
Ph.D.	2	2.9	2	2.9	65	94.2	69	100.0	69	65.7	0	0	36	34.3	105	100.1

Foreign language fluency was not demanded at the two-year graduate level. Only 37.4 percent of the institutions required a thesis, and 20.9 percent made it optional at the two-year level. Over 60 percent of the institutions required written and oral examinations for the two-year graduate degree.

The most stringent demands were found at the doctoral level. Practically all institutions demanded a thesis, a written exam, and an oral exam for the doctorate. The foreign language requirement appeared to be fading out even for the Ph.D. and was already rare for the Ed.D.

Earlier studies indicated that the thesis and the oral examination were less frequently required for the master's than for more advanced degrees. At the doctoral level all three—thesis, written examination, and oral examination—were reported to be important final experiences for the students in 1962-63. Perhaps the major change during the 1960's was the shift away from emphasis on competency in a foreign language as a requirement for advanced graduate degrees.

Tuition Costs

Data on tuition costs for part-time and full-time graduate students were very difficult to organize in view of the wide variation in practices among and within private and public institutions. The fact that some followed the quarter plan, others the trimester, and still others the more traditional semester system further complicated the issue. Tuition costs for part-time students in 1969-70 were computed on a per-credit basis for a quarter, a semester, and a trimester at public and private schools. The data in Table 36 support the expected conclusion that tuition costs were significantly lower at public than at private institutions. Tuition costs in 1969-70 were significantly higher than those recorded in previous studies. Since 1969-70 at least two increases in tuition have been registered for graduate students.

The range in tuition costs even within the same class of institutions was considerable. For out-of-state master's degree students attending public institutions the cost per semester credit hour was found

TABLE 36. Per-Credit Tuition Costs for Part-Time Graduate Students

	Per quarter				Per semester				Per trimester			
	In-state		Out-of-state		In-state		Out-of-state		In-state		Out-of-state	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Average												
M.A.	$ 8.3	$ —	$ 20.0	$ —	$ 26.4	$ 42.5	$ 32.5	$ 42.5	$ —	$ 35.0	$ —	$ 35.0
Two-year	28.8	33.0	33.9	30.0	18.8	42.1	39.6	42.1	—	—	—	—
Doctorate	29.0	62.5	47.6	62.5	29.7	62.5	56.3	63.8	17.0	47.0	54.0	72.0
Median												
M.A.	$ 8.8	$ —	$ 20.7	$ —	$ 29.0	$ 44.0	$34.0	$ 44.0	$ —	$ 35.0	$ —	$ 35.0
Two-year	14.0	33.0	19.0	33.0	16.5	44.0	34.0	44.0	—	—	—	—
Doctorate	21.1	81.5	25.7	81.5	18.4	59.8	37.3	60.0	17.0	47.0	54.0	72.0
Range—highest												
M.A.	$ 12.0	$ —	$ 27.0	$ —	$ 41.0	$ 52.0	$ 85.0	$ 52.0	$ —	$ 35.0	$ —	$35.0
Two-year	50.0	33.0	84.0	33.0	59.0	55.0	91.0	55.0	—	—	—	—
Doctorate	100.0	88.0	175.0	88.0	290.0	150.0	290.0	150.0	27.0	64.0	65.0	72.0
Range—lowest												
M.A.	$ 8.8	$ —	$ 15.0	$ —	$ 12.5	$ 35.0	$ 24.0	$ 35.0	$ —	$ 35.0	$ —	$ 35.0
Two-year	8.3	33.0	17.0	33.0	5.3[a]	26.0	13.0	26.0	—	—	—	—
Doctorate	10.0	38.0	10.0	38.0	4.0	25.0	9.0	25.0	7.0	30.0	43.0	72.0
Institutions responding												
M.A.	6	0	6	0	7	4	4	4	0	1	0	1
Two-year	5	1	5	1	29	7	26	6	0	0	0	0
Doctorate	20	4	19	4	33	22	36	20	2	2	2	1
Totals	31	5	30	5	69	33	66	30	2	3	2	2
Institutions responding	Public: In-state costs 102 Private: In-state costs 41						Public: Out-of-state costs 98 Private: Out-of-state costs 37					
Institutions not responding	Public: In-state costs 23 Private: In-state costs 2						Public: Out-of-state costs 27 Private: Out-of-state costs 6					
Total institutions	Public: In-state costs 125 Private: In-state costs 43						Public: Out-of-state costs 125 Private: Out-of-state costs 43					

---

[a] $5.3 is lowest charge per credit hour for public institutions with program.

to vary from a low of $24 to a high of $85. In-state and out-of-state students were treated the same in private institutions, but out-of-state students at public universities paid tuition costs that were about twice those of in-state students.

Full-time student tuition costs are summarized in Table 37. These data support the conclusions drawn from tuition costs for part-time students. These costs were not fixed and appeared to be escalating at the time of this writing.

Financial Aid

One of the pleas registered in the 1960 AASA Yearbook was for more financial aid to attract and prepare competent people in educational administration. Relatively small amounts of financial support for students were available in 1960. The 1962-63 data compiled by the CASA indicated that some scholarships and assistantships provided more than $3,000 a year, but they were relatively few.

Scholarships and Fellowships

Data compiled in Table 38 provide evidence that the numbers and amounts of graduate scholarships and fellowships for students preparing for the superintendency had increased substantially by 1969-70. The institutions responding to the 1962-63 survey reported a total of 262 graduate scholarships in educational administration; those responding in 1969-70 reported 649. The 1969-70 average was over eight per school. If institutions not responding were added, the total would be about 1,000 scholarships, or almost four times the number granted in 1962-63. The typical graduate scholarship or fellowship was over $4,250 for the academic year, if we use the median as a measure of what is "typical." At the doctoral level almost one in eight of the graduate scholarship or fellowship stipends paid in excess of $8,000 a year. In 1962-63 a stipend of $3,000 per year was considered high; in 1969-70 almost two-thirds (64.6 percent) of the stipends were for $3,000 or more. Even with the impact of inflation

TABLE 37. Per-Credit Tuition Costs for Full-Time Graduate Students

	Per quarter				Per semester				Per trimester			
	In-state		Out-of-state		In-state		Out-of-state		In-state		Out-of state	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Average												
M.A.	$121.7	$ —	$250.0	$ —	$225.0	$803.5	$637.5	$803.5	$ —	$650.0	$ —	$650.0
Two-year	116.7	460.0	233.3	460.0	167.9	520.0	383.3	520.0	—	—	—	—
Doctorate	188.3	715.0	380.9	715.0	225.9	754.0	484.7	788.1	185.0	355.0	450.0	830.0
Median												
M.A.	$136.5	$ —	$274.0	$ —	$174.0	$785.0	$549.0	$785.0	$ —	$650.0	$ —	$650.0
Two-year	136.5	460.0	261.5	460.0	152.6	450.0	339.0	450.0	—	—	—	—
Doctorate	179.0	715.0	369.0	715.0	196.5	740.7	453.2	759.0	185.0	355.0	450.0	830.0
Range—highest												
M.A.	$195.0	$ —	$355.0	$ —	$600.0	$1200.0	$1275.0	$1200.0	$ —	$650.0	$ —	$650.0
Two-year	199.0	460.0	399.0	460.0	610.0	750.0	860.0	750.0	—	—	—	—
Doctorate	369.0	715.0	819.0	715.0	1175.0	1900.0	1175.0	1900.0	185.0	355.0	450.0	830.0
Range—lowest												
M.A.	$ 95.0	$ —	$160.0	$ —	$ 69.0	444.0	$337.5	$650.0	$ —	$650.0	$ —	$650.0
Two-year	75.0	460.0	85.0	460.0	50.0	390.0	160.0	390.0	—	—	—	—
Doctorate	82.5	715.0	120.0	715.0	72.0	250.0	92.0	250.0	185.0	355.0	450.0	830.0
Institutions responding												
M.A.	6	0	6	0	6	4	6	4	0	1	0	1
Two-year	6	1	6	1	28	7	27	7	0	0	0	0
Doctorate	27	1	27	1	44	25	44	21	1	1	1	1
Total	39	2	39	2	78	36	77	32	1	2	1	2
Institutions responding	Public: In-state 118 Private: In-state 40								Public: Out-of-state 117 Private: Out-of-state 36			
Institutions not responding	Public: In-state 7 Private: In-state 3								Public: Out-of-state 8 Private: Out-of-state 7			
Total institutions	Public: In-state 125 Private: In-state 43								Public: Out-of-state 125 Private: Out-of-state 43			

TABLE 38. Scholarships and Fellowships Granted to Graduate Students Preparing for the Superintendency, 1969-70

Academic year payment	Scholarships and fellowships awarded for						Total	
	Master's		Two-year		Doctorate			
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
$8,000 or more	0	0%	0	0%	58	12.1%	58	9.0%
7,000 to 7,999	0	0	0	0	8	1.7	8	1.2
6,000 to 6,999	0	0	0	0	49	10.2	49	7.6
5,000 to 5,999	57	41.6	15	45.5	51	10.6	123	19.0
4,000 to 4,999	28	20.4	4	12.1	85	17.7	117	18.0
3,000 to 3,999	5	3.6	5	15.2	55	11.5	65	10.0
2,000 to 2,999	31	22.6	5	15.2	91	19.0	127	19.6
1,000 to 1,999	0	0	0	0	19	4.0	19	3.0
Less than $1,000	16	11.7	4	12.1	63	13.2	83	12.8
Totals	137	99.9%	33	100.1%	479	100.0%	649	100.2%
Institutions responding	31	12.5%	11	6.5%	59	56.2%	78	46.4%
Institutions not responding	82	48.8	76	45.2	24	22.9	37	22.0
Institutions without students receiving aid	45	26.8	44	26.2	22	21.0	53	31.5
Institutions without program	20	11.9	37	22.0	0	0	0	0
Total institutions	68	100.0%	168	99.9%	105	100.1%	168	99.9%
Average amount	$3,959.9		$4,015.2		$4,205.6		$4,144.1	
Median amount	4,606.1		4,749.0		4,140.2		4,264.0	

during the interval, scholarship and fellowship amounts had increased significantly by the end of the 1960's. At the other end of the spectrum, about three universities in ten (31.5 percent) gave no scholarship aid to full-time graduate students in educational administration in 1969-70.

Funds for graduate scholarships and fellowships in educational administration came from a variety of sources, such as institutional development funds, U.S. government grants, state legislatures, and foundations. Over one-half of all the funds came from foundations and the U.S. government. About 30 percent came from foundations, 28 percent from the U.S. government, 15 percent from state legislative enactments, and 14 percent from institutional development funds. The exact percentages appear in Table 39. It is interesting to note that private universities obtained a higher percentage of their scholarship grants from the federal government than did publicly controlled institutions.

Assistantships

Data in Table 40 on the size of assistantships awarded in 1969-70 to graduate students in educational administration allow the conclusion that, in general, public institutions provided assistantships that paid substantially more at the master's and two-year study levels, and somewhat more at the doctoral level, than those offered by private schools. The higher paying assistantships were likely to be awarded to doctoral students. If the median is accepted as the best measure of the typical, then the typical assistantship in 1969-70 totaled $1,881 on the master's level, $2,134 on the two-year level, and $3,414 on the doctoral level. In all types of institutions almost 20 percent of the assistantships awarded at the doctoral level were for sums of $5,000 or more. The number of doctoral assistantships paying $5,000 or more was almost twice the number paying $2,000 or less.

The total number of assistantships reported for 1962-63 was 532. In 1969-70 the total was 912 for the 116 institutions providing data for this question, which averages out to almost eight assistantships per institution. It is estimated that the total number of assistantships awarded in educational administration in 1969-70, including schools not responding to this question or not participating in the study, was about 1,150. It should be noted that over 17 percent of the institutions offered no student assistantships.

Aid from Local District

The AASA Commission found in its first research study, *The American School Superintendent*, that if the superintendent received aid from his school system the average amount was about $900 for the master's, almost $2,000 for the two-year or special-

TABLE 39. Sources of Funds for Graduate Student Scholarships and Fellowships

Source	Institutions					
	Public		Private		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Institutional development funds	23	13.8%	9	13.0%	32	13.6%
U.S. government grants	41	24.6	26	37.7	67	28.4
State legislature enactments	29	17.4	7	10.1	36	15.3
Foundation grants	50	29.9	21	30.4	71	30.1
Other	24	14.4	6	8.7	30	12.7
Totals	167	100.1%	69	99.9%	236	100.1%
Single source	34	41.0	9	32.1	43	38.7
More than one source	49	59.0	19	67.9	68	61.3
Total	83	100.0%	28	100.0%	111	100.0%
Institutions responding	83	66.4%	28	65.1%	111	66.1%
Institutions not responding	31	24.8	9	20.9	40	23.8
Institutions without program	11	8.8	6	14.0	17	10.1
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%

TABLE 40. Assistantships Awarded to Graduate Students Preparing for the Superintendency, 1969-70

Amount	Assistantships awarded by																		Total assistantships for all levels	
	Public institutions for						Private institutions for						All types of institutions for							
	Master's		Two-year		Doctorate		Master's		Two-year		Doctorate		Master's		Two-year		Doctorate			
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
$5,000 or more	2	2.2%	0	0 %	87	16.4%	0	0 %	0	0 %	53	29.0%	2	1.7%	0	0 %	140	19.6%	142	15.6%
4,000 to 4,999	1	1.1	8	13.3	76	14.3	0	0	0	0	37	20.0	1	0.9	8	9.8	113	15.8	122	13.4
3,000 to 3,999	11	12.0	10	16.7	164	30.9	0	0	0	0	12	6.6	11	9.4	10	12.2	176	24.7	197	21.6
2,000 to 2,999	38	41.3	24	40.0	176	33.2	2	8.0	2	9.1	29	15.8	40	34.2	26	31.7	205	28.8	271	29.7
1,000 to 1,999	29	31.5	1	1.7	21	4.0	5	20.0	0	0	8	4.4	34	29.1	1	1.2	29	4.1	64	7.0
Less than $1,000	11	12.0	17	28.3	6	1.1	18	72.0	20	90.9	44	24.0	29	24.8	37	45.1	50	7.0	116	12.7
Totals	92	100.1%	60	100.0%	530	99.9%	25	100.0%	22	100.0%	183	99.8%	117	100.1%	82	100.0%	713	100.0%	912	100.0%
Institutions responding	37	29.6%	26	20.8%	63	84.0%	5	11.6%	3	7.0%	21	70.0%	42	25.0%	29	17.3%	84	80.0%	116	69.0%
Institutions not responding	62	49.6	57	45.6	9	12.0	19	44.2	18	41.9	3	10.0	81	48.2	75	44.6	12	11.4	23	13.7
Institutions without students receiving assistantships	12	9.6	19	15.2	3	4.0	13	30.2	8	18.6	6	20.0	25	14.9	27	16.1	9	8.6	29	17.3
Institutions without program	14	11.2	23	18.4	0	0	6	14.0	14	32.6	0	0	20	11.9	37	22.0	0	0	0	0
Total institutions	125	100.0%	125	100.0%	75	100.0%	43	100.0%	43	100.1%	30	100.0%	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average amount	$2,092.4		$2,350.0		$3,526.4		$860.0		$681.8		$3,314.2		$1,836.1		$1,902.4		$3,471.9		$3.120.9	
Median amount	2,170.1		2.519.8		3,380.1		722.2		522.7		3,915.7		1,881.4		2,133.6		3,413.8		3,026.9	

ist, and over $3,500 for the doctorate. Data from institutions of higher learning, as opposed to superintendents, on financial aid from school districts coming to graduate students in 1969-70 is organized in

TABLE 41. Graduate Students Receiving Financial Aid from a School District for Their Superintendency Preparation

Amount of aid	Students receiving aid							
	Master's		Two-year		Doctorate		Total	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
$8,000 or more	41	40.2%	24	36.9%	113	39.8%	178	39.5%
7,000 to 7,999	5	4.9	12	18.5	24	8.5	41	9.1
6,000 to 6,999	0	0	7	10.8	50	17.6	57	12.6
5,000 to 5,999	31	30.4	5	7.7	44	15.5	80	17.7
4,000 to 4,999	5	4.9	4	6.2	14	5.0	23	5.1
3,000 to 3,999	12	11.8	9	13.8	16	5.6	37	8.2
2,000 to 2,999	1	1.0	2	3.1	18	6.3	21	4.7
1,000 to 1,999	7	6.9	2	3.1	5	1.8	14	3.1
Less than $1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	102	100.1%	65	100.0%	284	100.1%	451	100.0%
Institutions responding	14	8.3%	20	11.9%	51	48.6%	72	42.9%
Institutions not responding	95	56.5	75	44.6	34	32.4	48	28.6
Institutions without students receiving aid	39	23.2	36	21.4	20	19.0	48	28.6
Institutions without program	20	11.9	37	22.0	0	0	0	0
Total institutions	168	99.9%	168	99.9%	105	100.0%	168	100.1%
Average amount	$6,215.7		$6,530.8		$6,616.2		$6,513.3	
Median amount	5,853.8		7,332.3		6,909.0		6,893.7	

TABLE 42. Graduate Students Obtaining Loans from Their Institutions of Higher Learning for Their Superintendency Preparation

Amount of loan	Students obtaining loans							
	Master's		Two-Year		Doctorate		Total	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
$1,000 or more	15	44.1%	11	50.0%	65	68.4%	91	60.3%
Less than $1,000	19	55.9	11	50.0	30	31.6	60	39.7
Totals	34	100.0%	22	100.0%	95	100.0%	151	100.0%
Institutions responding	10	6.0%	5	3.0%	22	21.0%	37	22.0%
Institutions not responding	95	56.5	84	50.0	59	56.2	74	44.0
Institutions providing no loans	43	25.6	42	25.0	24	22.9	57	33.9
Institutions without program	20	11.9	37	22.0	0	0	0	0
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.1%	168	99.9%

Table 41. Only about 43 percent of the institutions reported any graduate students receiving local district aid. A total of 28.6 percent of the institutions stated that their students received no such support; another 28.6 percent failed to answer the question. The institutions responding indicated that 451 of their students obtained some local school support in the form of salary paid while attending graduate school. The median amount of such salary was almost $6,900. It is estimated that 15 to 20 percent of the full-time graduate students enrolled received such aid.

Loans

Data in Table 42 on students obtaining loans for graduate study are based on a very limited response. About one-third of the universities provided loans, but only 22 percent provided them to graduate students. Of these loans, the largest numbers and amounts went to doctoral students. About 60 percent of the loans were for sums of $1,000 or more and 40 percent for less than $1,000. A relatively small percentage of students were helped by these loans, perhaps no more than 7 or 8 percent of the full-time enrollment in graduate educational administration programs.

Summary

A variety of selection instruments, or indicators, continued to be used in 1969-70 to determine admission to graduate study in educational administration. The major ones were written letters of recommendation, standardized test scores, character references, completion of specific undergraduate courses, grade point averages, oral exams, and interviews. Relatively little changed during the 1960's in the admission of students to graduate programs.

Institutions that considered test scores in the selection of candidates were far more likely to use the Graduate Record Examination and the Miller Analogies Test than any other tests. The majority of institutions that used tests specified cutoff scores; these varied considerably.

A minimum undergraduate grade point average was specified for admission to graduate study in practically all institutions of higher learning. A 3.0 average was typically required for admission to two-year and doctoral study, in contrast to a 2.7 for the master's.

Data collected on maximum age were highly suspect in view of the fact that relatively few institutions responded to this item. No maximum age was specified for admission to master's and two-year study in the majority of institutions, but a cutoff point of around age 45 for starting doctoral study appeared to be fairly common.

Most institutions continued to demand two or three years of teaching experience for admission to graduate study leading to the superintendency. Administrative experience was not usually required for admission to the master's level, but about two years was commonly required for admission to doctoral study. The typical institution in 1969-70 admitted about 28 students for master's study, 13 for two-year graduate study, and 16 for doctoral study in educational administration.

The evidence suggests that considerable progress was made in the 1960's in full-time continuous residence requirements for degree programs in educational administration. All institutions with a doctoral degree program required residence of at least one term, and over 94 percent demanded at least one year. Full-time continuous residence requirements were less likely for the master's than for other graduate study levels.

A thesis, written examination, and oral examination were required of those seeking a doctor's degree in practically all institutions. Over one-third of the institutions called for completion of a thesis for the specialist degree, and more than 61 percent demanded satisfactory ratings on written and oral examinations for this degree. Competency in a foreign language, by and large, was not required of those pursuing the master's, two-year, or doctor of education degrees. Even at the Ph.D. level only about 61 percent of the institutions in 1969-70 required mastery of one or more foreign languages. There was clearly a trend toward the elimination or reduction of foreign language competency as a requirement in educational administration programs.

Tuition costs varied greatly among public and private institutions. Within public universities, out-of-state students paid more than state residents. More and better-paying scholarships and fellowships were available to graduate students in educational administration in 1969-70 than ever before. The typical scholarship or fellowship paid $4,264 for the year. The number of these awards almost quadrupled during the past decade. Foundation and U.S. government grants accounted for almost 60 percent of the scholarships and fellowships awarded in 1969-70. Scholarships from state legislatures and from institutional development funds accounted for less than 30 percent of the total number.

The number of assistantship awards more than doubled during the 1960's. The typical institution awarded about eight assistantships in 1969-70. The dollar amount of assistantships, as of fellowships and scholarships, was likely to be higher for doctoral students than for those pursuing other graduate degrees. There were more doctoral assistantships in the $5,000 and above category than in the $2,000 and below category.

A limited number of students received financial aid (usually salary payments) from local districts for pursuing graduate studies. The typical amount paid was almost $6,900. Relatively few students obtained loans from their graduate institutions. The amount of such loans was small, with 60 percent being over and 40 percent under $1,000.

Chapter 6

Graduate Enrollments and Student Characteristics

Earlier chapters made reference to graduate students in educational administration, but only as related to requirements confronting them. This chapter will focus more specifically on the students themselves. Comparisons with the past will be limited here, for relatively little data was collected on student characteristics in the 1958-59 and 1962-63 studies. Much of what follows will be confined to a description of data collected during 1969-70.

Number of Students Admitted

Data on the number of students admitted to graduate educational administration programs in 1969-70 are summarized in Table 43. More students were admitted to the master's than to any other level. If the median is used to indicate typical practice, in 1969-70 the typical institution admitted about 28 students to master's degree study, about 13 to two-year graduate study, and about 16 to doctoral study. However, a wide variation was noted. As many as 40 students were admitted to master's programs in 29 percent of the institutions, to two-year programs in almost 10 percent of the institutions, and to doctoral programs in over 15 percent of the institutions.

Educational Administration Enrollments

Total 1969-70 educational administration enrollments for the 128 institutions responding to this question are summarized in Table 44. Over one-third (36.7 percent) reported fewer than 50 graduate students; 63.3 percent reported fewer than 100; and 88.3 percent reported fewer than 250. Only two institutions reported enrollments in educational administration of 500 or more during the 1969-70 school year.

Enrollment data were analyzed further in terms of full- and part-time students. This information is summarized in Table 45. It should be noted that the part-time enrollment was about nine times the full-time enrollment at the master's level, about ten times the full-time enrollment at the two-year graduate study level, but less than two times the full-time enrollment at the doctoral level. Most part-time students were pursuing the master's and two-year graduate degrees.

Full-time doctor of education student enrollments ranged from only one student (if institutions with no such enrollees are excluded) to 110 students in 1969-70. A range from a low of one to a high of 90 full-time students was registered for Ph.D. programs. Variations in part-time student enrollments were even greater. At the master's degree level part-time enrollments ranged from a low of two students to a high of 585.

Full-time graduate enrollments in the 133 institutions responding in 1969-70 totaled 3,378. Based on knowledge of institutions participating in the study but not responding to the question, as well as of major institutions not participating, the AASA Commission estimates that the total number of full-time students in educational administration programs during 1969-70 was approximately 4,250. This estimate is based on the assumptions that data obtained from the institutions responding was accurate and that the enrollments in other institutions would not vary substantially from the patterns noted.

The total number of part-time students for the institutions reporting in 1969-70 was 16,772. An estimate including those institutions not supplying data would be approximately 21,000 part-time graduate students in educational administration.

The number of full-time Ed.D. degree students in educational administration exceeded the number of full-time master's degree candidates. The number of full-time Ph.D. candidates was almost twice that of full-time two-year graduate degree candidates. The number of part-time two-year graduate degree candidates was greater than the number of part-time students pursuing the Ed.D. and Ph.D. combined.

The 1960 AASA Yearbook indicated that the number of full-time students enrolled in educational administration programs ranged from 0 to 200. This figure, based on all degree levels, is difficult to compare with the data gathered in 1969-70. The range of part-time enrollments in 1958-59 was from a low of 3 to a high of 700. In general, the number of full- and part-time students enrolled in preparation programs for school administration reported in 1960 appeared to be substantially less than the number enrolled in 1969-70, but the exact magnitude of the increase could not be ascertained for lack of comparable data.

Data presented so far on full- and part-time students have not included those who were considered active graduate degree candidates but were not enrolled during the 1969-70 school year. Information on these students is organized in Table 46. By far the largest number were pursuing a master's degree. The "typical" institution had about 50 of these stu-

TABLE 43. Number of Students Admitted to Graduate Educational Administration Programs, 1969-70

Number admitted	Institutions admitting given numbers of students to					
	Master's		Two-year		Doctorate	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
None	9	6.5%	3	2.5%	2	2.2%
1–4	7	5.1	16	13.1	6	6.5
5–9	11	8.0	21	17.2	16	17.2
10–14	10	7.2	26	21.3	17	18.3
15–19	9	6.5	9	7.4	14	15.1
20–24	17	12.3	11	9.0	10	10.8
25–29	12	8.7	10	8.2	4	4.3
30–34	18	13.0	12	9.8	4	4.3
35–39	5	3.6	2	1.6	6	6.5
40 or more	40	29.0	12	9.8	14	15.1
Total	138	99.9%	122	99.9%	93	100.3%
Institutions responding	138	82.1%	122	72.6%	93	88.6%
Institutions not responding	10	6.0	9	5.4	12	11.4
Institutions without program	20	11.9	37	22.0	0	0
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%
Average number of students admitted	27.2[a] 25.4[b]		17.8[a] 17.4[b]		20.1[a] 19.7[b]	
Median number of students admitted	28.6[a] 26.7[b]		13.4[a] 13.1[b]		16.5[a] 16.1[b]	

[a] "None" category excluded in computation
[b] "None" category included in computation

TABLE 44. Graduate Enrollments in Educational Administration Programs

Enrollment	Institutions where highest degree offered was						Total	
	Master's		Two-year		Doctorate			
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1,000 or more	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %
750 to 999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
500 to 749	1	6.7	0	0	1	1.3	2	1.5
250 to 499	0	0	4	11.4	9	11.5	13	10.2
200 to 249	2	13.3	0	0	5	6.4	7	5.5
100 to 199	3	20.0	6	17.1	16	20.5	25	19.5
50 to 99	3	20.0	9	25.7	22	28.2	34	26.6
Under 50	6	40.0	16	45.7	25	32.1	47	36.7
Totals	15	100.0%	35	100.0%	78	100.0%	128	100.0%
Institutions responding	15	83.3%	35	77.8%	78	74.3%	128	76.2%
Institutions not responding	3	16.7	10	22.2	27	25.7	40	23.8
Total institutions	18	100.0%	45	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average enrollment	166.7		99.3		125.6		123.2	
Median enrollment	83.0		50.0		83.0		76.0	
Range—highest	615		309		526		615	
Range—lowest	2		3		10		2	

TABLE 45. Number of Full-Time and Part-Time Students Enrolled in Educational Administration Programs

Enrollment	Institutions with given enrollment of full-time students in								Institutions with given enrollment of part-time students in							
	Master's		Two-year		Ed. D.		Ph. D.		Master's		Two-year		Ed. D.		Ph. D.	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
None	11	8.3%	27	27.8%	2	2.7%	4	7.1%	5	3.8%	4	3.4%	3	3.8%	8	15.1%
1-5	63	47.4	54	55.1	12	16.2	22	39.3	9	6.8	20	16.9	15	19.0	13	24.5
6-10	28	21.1	11	11.3	10	13.5	9	16.1	8	6.1	22	18.6	10	12.7	9	17.0
11-15	13	9.8	2	2.1	19	25.7	6	10.7	5	3.8	12	10.2	7	8.9	2	3.8
16-20	6	4.5	2	2.1	10	13.5	2	3.6	3	2.3	8	6.8	7	8.9	3	5.7
21-25	6	4.5	0	0	4	5.4	5	8.9	11	8.3	8	6.8	5	6.3	3	5.7
26-50	5	3.8	1	1.0	15	20.3	5	8.9	31	23.5	25	21.2	13	16.5	9	17.0
51-75	1	0.8	0	0	1	1.4	2	3.6	20	15.2	6	51.0	12	15.2	1	1.9
76-100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.8	8	6.1	3	2.5	3	3.8	3	5.7
Over 100	0	0	0	0	1	1.4	0	0	32	24.2	10	8.5	4	5.1	2	3.8
Totals	133	100.2%	97	100.0%	74	100.1%	56	100.0%	132	100.1%	118	100.0%	79	100.2%	53	100.2%
Institutions responding	133	79.2%	97	57.7%	74	70.5%	56	53.3%	132	78.6%	118	70.2%	79	75.2%	53	50.5%
Institutions not responding	15	8.9	34	20.2	8	7.6	13	12.4	16	9.5	13	7.7	3	2.9	16	15.2
Institutions without program	20	11.9	37	22.0	23	21.9	36	34.3	20	11.9	37	22.0	23	21.9	36	34.3
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	99.9%	105	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%	168	99.9%	105	100.0%	105	100.0%
Total number of students enrolled	1,067		322		1,374		615		9,632		3,799		2,292		1,049	
Average number of students enrolled	8.7[a] 3.0[b]		4.6[a] 3.3[b]		19.1[a] 18.6[b]		11.8[a] 11.0[b]		75.8[a] 73.0[b]		33.3[a] 32.1[b]		30.2[a] 29.0[b]		23.3[a] 19.8[b]	
Median number of students enrolled	5.0[a] 4.0[b]		3.0[a] 2.0[b]		14.0[a] 14.0[b]		8.0[a] 6.0[b]		49.0[a] 47.0[b]		17.0[a] 16.0[b]		20.0[a] 19.0[b]		13.0[a] 8.0[b]	
Range—highest	70		30		110		90		585		200		204		124	
Range—lowest	1		1		1		1		2		1		3		1	

[a] "None" category excluded in computation
[b] "None" category included in computation

dents at the master's level, 29 at the two-year level, 20 at the Ed.D. level, and 9 at the Ph.D. level. The median number in active candidacy but not enrolled at all levels was about 31. The smallest number of students in this status reported by any institution was one; the largest was 800. The total number of unenrolled but active candidates for all degrees was a substantial 21,885. The AASA Commission had no basis to judge the accuracy of data supplied, but working from these data estimated the total number in active candidacy but not enrolled to be about 30,000. Adding this total to other estimates of those enrolled as full- and part-time students would produce the estimate of 55,200 engaged in graduate educational administration study during 1969-70. This estimated total should not be confused with those who actually completed degree programs in educational administration.

Number Having Superintendency as Goal

Graduate students enrolled in educational administration include those who may become principals, supervisors, and other administrative personnel, as well as superintendents. Institutions were asked to indicate the percentage of students in their educational administration graduate programs who recognized the superintendency as their objective. As shown in Table 47, the median was 35.1 percent, and the average was 38.8 percent. In short, over one-third were working toward the superintendency. Using the figure of 35 percent, about 19,320 of the 55,200 candidates in graduate programs in educational administration in 1969-70 could be assumed to have had the superintendency as their objective. This number is larger than the AASA membership and greater than the number of superintendencies available in the United States.

Age and Sex of Full-Time Students

The average age of graduate students in departments of educational administration in 1969-70 is summarized in Table 48. It should be observed that no department reported an average student age of higher than 50. Only 8 percent reported an average age of under 30. The majority (54.7 percent) reported the average age to be in the 30 to 34 bracket.

TABLE 46. Number of Active Candidates Not Enrolled as Full-Time or Part-Time Students, 1969-1970

Number of unenrolled candidates	Institutions with unenrolled active candidates at								Total—all levels	
	Master's level		Two-year level		Ed.D. level		Ph.D. level			
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
None	6	4.9%	3	2.9%	5	7.6%	2	4.2%	16	11.1%
1-9	7	5.7	19	18.1	10	15.2	18	37.5	54	37.5
10-19	10	8.2	16	15.1	17	25.8	12	25.0	55	38.2
20-29	15	12.3	13	12.4	8	12.1	4	8.3	40	27.8
30-39	11	9.0	17	16.2	7	10.6	2	4.2	37	25.7
40-49	8	6.6	5	4.8	4	6.1	4	8.3	21	14.6
50 or more	65	53.3	32	30.5	15	22.7	6	12.5	118	81.9
Total	122	100.0%	105	100.1%	66	100.1%	48	100.0%	144	100.0%
Institutions responding	122	72.6%	105	62.5%	66	62.9%	48	45.7%	144	85.7%
Institutions not responding	26	15.5	26	15.5	16	15.2	21	20.0	24	14.3
Institutions without program	20	11.9	37	22.0	23	21.9	36	34.3	0	0
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	105	100.0%	105	100.0%	168	100.0%
Total number of unenrolled candidates	12,650		5,346		2,658		1,231		21,885	
Average number of unenrolled candidates	103.7		50.9		40.3		25.7		64.2	
Median number of unenrolled candidates	49.6		29.2		19.5		8.9		30.6	
Range—highest	800		800		350		160		800	
Range—lowest	2		2		2		1		1	

It can be said that the typical department had full-time enrollees in educational administration in 1969-70 whose average age was around 33.

Data on the oldest and youngest full-time graduate students in educational administration are organized in Tables 49 and 50. In over 43 percent of the departments reporting the oldest full-time enrollee was age 50 or older. Typically the oldest full-time student was approximately 48. The age distribution of the youngest students is summarized in Table 50. In over 60 percent of the institutions reporting the youngest graduate student was age 25 or younger. Typically the youngest was approximately 25 years old.

TABLE 47. Percentage of Graduate Students in Educational Administration Having the Superintendency as Objective

Percentage of students	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
0%	3	1.9%
1-9	8	5.2
10-19	22	14.3
20-29	36	23.4
30-39	14	9.1
40-49	10	6.5
50-59	31	20.1
60-69	11	7.1
70-79	14	9.1
80-89	3	1.9
90-99	2	1.3
Totals	154	99.9%
Institutions responding	154	91.7%
Institutions not responding	14	8.3
Total institutions	168	100.0%
Average percentage	38.8%	
Median percentage	35.1	

TABLE 48. Average Age of Full-Time Graduate Students in Educational Administration Programs

Average age	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
Under 30	11	8.0%
30–34	75	54.7
35–39	43	31.4
40–44	7	5.1
45–49	1	0.7
50 or over	0	0
Totals	137	99.9%
Institutions responding	137	81.5%
Institutions not responding	27	16.1
Institutions with no full-time students	4	2.4
Total institutions	168	100.0%
Average age	33.8	
Median age	33.1	

TABLE 49. Age of Oldest Full-Time Graduate Students in Educational Administration Programs

Age of oldest student	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
Under 40	21	14.6%
40–44	17	11.8
45–49	44	30.6
50–54	38	26.4
Over 54	24	16.7
Totals	144	100.1%
Institutions responding	144	85.7%
Institutions not responding	20	11.9
Institutions with no full-time students	4	2.4
Total institutions	168	100.0%
Average age of oldest students	47.9	
Median age of oldest students	48.1	

As shown in Table 51, women constituted a very small percentage of the total number of graduate students in educational administration in 1969-70. Over one-fourth (26.9 percent) of the universities reporting had no women graduate students in educational administration. The average was less than 10 percent, and the median was less than 7 percent women enrolled. The prior study by this Commission, *The American School Superintendent*, showed that the superintendency was primarily a man's world. Relatively few women could be found as superintendents. The data in Table 51 suggest that this situation is not likely to change very much in the near future.

Degree Completions

The number of students earning various degrees in educational administration in 1960-61 and 1968-69 are summarized in Tables 52-55. The sizable range among institutions is illustrated by master's degree completions, as shown at the bottom of Table 52. The range was greater in 1968-69 than in 1960-61. Less than 5 percent of the institutions reported no master's completions in 1960-61, and a little over 5 percent had no completions in 1968-69. In making comparisons institutions reporting no completions will be excluded from the computations. The typical

TABLE 50. Age of Youngest Full-Time Graduate Students in Educational Administration Programs

Age of youngest student	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
Under 23	14	9.7%
23	20	13.8
24	25	17.2
25	29	20.0
26	23	15.9
27	11	7.6
28	8	5.5
29	4	2.8
30	7	4.8
Over 30	4	2.8
Totals	145	100.1%
Institutions responding	145	86.3%
Institutions not responding	19	11.3
Institutions with no full-time students	4	2.4
Total institutions	168	100.0%
Average age of youngest students	25.3	
Median age of youngest students	24.5	

TABLE 51. Percentage of Full-Time Graduate Students in Educational Administration Who Were Women

Percentage	Number of institutions	Percent of institutions
0%	39	26.9%
1–4	21	14.5
5–9	29	20.0
10–14	25	17.2
15–19	3	2.1
20% or more	28	19.3
Totals	145	100.0%
Institutions responding	145	86.3%
Institutions not responding	19	11.3
Institutions with no full-time students	4	2.4
Total institutions	168	100.0%
Average percentage	9.6%	
Median percentage	6.8	

institution graduated about 18 with a master's degree in educational administration in 1960-61, as compared with approximately 25 in 1968-69. This is an increase of about 7 students, or a gain of about 39 percent. The total completing the master's program jumped from 2,853 in 1960-61 to 4,331 in 1968-69. Including institutions not responding to the question as well as those not participating in the study, the AASA Commission estimates that about 5,200 students completed their master's degree in educational administration in 1968-69. Roughly 35 percent, or over 1,800, of these had the superintendency as their objective.

The numbers completing a two-year program increased sharply between 1960-61 and 1968-69. Earlier studies indicated that the two-year graduate degree program was pretty well established by the beginning of the 1960's, with its acceptance increasing. The range among institutions in numbers of students graduating with this award is indicated in Table 53. It is not as large a range as that noted for the master's degree. The median number graduated from two-year programs in 1960-61 and in 1968-69 was less than five. The data are difficult to interpret if institutions with no completions are excluded, in view of the fact that in 1960-61 almost

TABLE 52. Number of Students Completing Master's Programs in Educational Administration, 1960-61 and 1968-69

Number of master's completions	Institutions with given numbers of degree completions in				Change from 1960–61 to 1968–69
	1960–61		1968–69		
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.
None	5	4.5%	8	5.6%	+3
1–4	8	7.3	5	3.5	–3
5–9	16	14.5	7	4.9	–9
10–14	19	17.3	18	12.6	–1
15–19	12	10.9	22	15.4	+10
20–24	10	9.1	14	9.8	+4
25–29	9	8.2	13	9.1	+4
30 or more	31	28.2	56	39.2	+25
Totals	110	100.0%	143	100.1%	+33
Institutions responding	110	65.5%	143	85.1%	+33
Institutions not responding	58	34.5	25	14.9	–33
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	0
Total number of completions	2,853		4,331		+1,478
Average number of completions	27.2[a] 25.9[b]		32.1[a] 30.3[b]		+4.9[a] +4.4[b]
Median number of completions	18.2[a] 17.1[b]		25.2[a] 23.3[b]		+7.0[a] +6.2[b]
Range—highest	170		192		+22
Range—lowest	1		1		0

[a] "None" category excluded in computation
[b] "None" category included in computation

two-thirds (64.4 percent) of the institutions graduated no students with the so-called specialist degree. A better indicator of growth is obtained by including those institutions with "no completions" in computing the median and mean. The average school more than doubled the annual output of specialist degree graduates during the 1960's.

The gross number of two-year graduates at the institutions responding increased from 240 in 1960-61 to 906 in 1968-69. This increase demonstrates the growing acceptance of the two-year graduate degree program in educational administration. The AASA Commission estimates that the total number of two-year program completions in educational administration at all universities in 1968-69 was approximately 1,100.

In 1960-61 almost one-fourth (23.6 percent) of the institutions made no Ed.D. degree awards. In contrast, only 4 percent of the institutions offering the program had no Ed.D. graduates in 1968-69. About 60 percent had one to nine Ed.D. graduates in both base years. If the median is accepted as an indicator of the typical pattern, and institutions with no degree completions are excluded from computations, the typical Ed.D. annual production jumped from over three students in 1960-61 to almost seven in 1968-69. Thus the annual production rate almost doubled during a period of less than a decade. The number of students completing an Ed.D. in the institutions responding went from 271 in 1960-61 to 648 in 1968-69. These data appear in Table 54. The AASA Commission estimates that the total Ed.D. production in educational administration was approximately 800.

Figures on students completing the Ph.D. degree in educational administration in 1960-61 and 1968-69 are organized in Table 55. The total number of institutions offering the Ph.D. increased during the period. The median number of students earning the Ph.D. grew from 2.8 to 3.6. In 1960-61, 58.3 percent of the institutions had no Ph.D. completions. In 1968-69 only about 16 percent reported no Ph.D. completions. Once again, the average computed by including institutions reporting no degree completions may be a better indicator of trends. The average increase was from 1.4 students in 1960-61 to 4.9 in 1968-69—that is, the average production almost tripled. The gross number of students awarded Ph.D.'s grew from 68 in 1960-61 to 307 in 1968-69. It is estimated that the total Ph.D. production in educational administration in 1968-69 was approximately 400, an estimate that includes those institutions not answering this question and those not participating in the survey.

Combining the estimates of students earning various types of degrees in educational administration would yield a total production figure of approximately 7,500 for 1968-69. About 2,625 (35 percent) could be presumed to have the superintendency as their goal.

In the 1950's the AASA Committee for the Advancement of School Administration observed that there was no shortage of trained personnel in educational administration. CASA called for an increase in program quality. It suggested reducing the number of institutions preparing educational administrators, particularly superintendents, as an important first step. But the data in this chapter indicate that more than 10 years after the CASA pronouncement there were *more*, rather than fewer, institutions engaged in the preparation of educational administrators, and that the annual degree production had increased sharply as well.

Summary

Educational administration departments in universities did not have large enrollments in 1969-70. Most (63.3 percent) had fewer than 100 graduate students. The numbers of full- and part-time students enrolled showed a tremendous range among institutions, as was the case in previous years. There were more full-time students pursuing the doctor of education degree than any other graduate degree. If part-time students only are considered, the number pursuing the master's degree exceeded the number pursuing all other degrees combined. There were about five times as many part-time students as full-time students. The typical master's degree program in 1969-70 had fewer than five full-time students; the typical two-year program had approximately three full-time students; the typical Ed.D. program had almost 14 full-time students; and the typical Ph.D. program had over seven full-time students. The Commission estimates that there were approximately 4,200 full-time students and over 21,000 part-time students enrolled in various graduate degree programs in 1969-70. Those in active candidacy but not enrolled that year would swell the total to an estimated 55,200.

Only about 35 percent of the graduate students enrolled in educational administration had the superintendency as their objective. The average age of full-time graduate students in educational administration was 33. The oldest student was about 48 and the youngest about 25. Most of the full-time enrollees were men; less than 10 percent were women.

The number of graduate degrees in educational

TABLE 53. Number of Students Completing Two-Year Graduate Programs in Educational Administration, 1960-61 and 1968-69

Number of two-year program completions	Institutions with given numbers of degree completions in				Change from 1960–61 to 1968–69
	1960–61		1968–69		
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.
None	47	64.4%	14	12.1%	−33
1–4	13	17.8	49	42.2	+36
5–9	3	4.1	21	18.1	+18
10–14	5	6.8	9	7.8	+ 4
15–19	0	0	11	9.5	+11
20 or more	5	6.8	12	10.3	+ 7
Totals	73	99.9%	116	100.0%	+43
Institutions responding	73	43.5%	116	69.0%	+43
Institutions not responding	95	56.5	52	31.0	−43
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	0
Total number of completions	240		906		+666
Average number of completions	9.2[a] 3.3[b]		8.9[a] 7.8[b]		−0.3[a] +4.5[b]
Median number of completions	4.8[a] 0[b]		4.6[a] 3.6[b]		−0.2[a] +3.6[b]
Range—highest	50		75		+28
Range—lowest	1		1		0

[a] "None" category excluded in computation

[b] "None" category included in computation

TABLE 54. Number of Students Completing Ed.D. Programs in Educational Administration, 1960-61 and 1968-69

Number of Ed. D. completions	Institutions with given number of completions in				Change from 1960-61 to 1968-69
	1960-61		1968-69		
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.
None	13	23.6%	3	4.0%	−10
1-4	25	45.5	25	33.3	0
5-9	8	14.5	21	28.0	+13
10-14	4	7.3	12	16.0	+8
15-19	4	7.3	7	9.3	+3
20 or more	1	1.8	7	9.3	+6
Totals	55	100.0%	75	99.9%	+20
Institutions responding	55	52.4%	75	71.4%	+20
Institutions not responding	50	47.6	30	28.6	−20
Total institutions	105	100.0%	105	100.0%	0
Total number of completions	271		648		+377
Average number of completions	6.5[a] 4.9[b]		9.0[a] 8.6[b]		+2.5[a] +3.7[b]
Median number of completions	3.4[a] 2.4[b]		6.7[a] 6.4[b]		+3.3[a] +4.0[b]
Range—highest	39		39		0
Range—lowest	1		1		0

[a] "None" category excluded in computation
[b] "None" category included in computation

administration awarded during the period from 1960-61 to 1968-69 increased sharply. The number per institution completing a master's jumped from 18 in 1960-61 to 25 in 1968-69. Specialist degree completions more than tripled during this period. Ed.D. degrees awarded increased from 3.4 per institution in 1960-61 to 6.7 in 1968-69. The number of Ph.D. graduates more than quadrupled during the same period. It was estimated that the annual Ed.D. production in 1968-69 was 800, or double the annual Ph.D. production of 400.

The AASA Commission estimated that about 7,500 graduate degrees in educational administration were awarded in 1968-69. About 2,625, or 35 percent, of the recipients had the superintendency as their goal.

TABLE 55. Number of Students Completing Ph.D. Programs in Educational Administration, 1960-61 and 1968-69

Number of Ph. D. completions	Institutions with given number of completions in				Change from 1960-61 to 1968-69
	1960-61		1968-69		
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.
None	28	58.3%	10	15.9%	−18
1-4	15	31.3	30	47.6	+15
5-9	4	8.3	11	17.5	+7
10-14	1	2.1	6	9.5	+5
15-19	0	0	4	6.3	+4
20 or more	0	0	2	3.2	+2
Totals	48	100.0%	63	100.0%	+15
Institutions responding	48	45.7%	63	60.0%	+15
Institutions not responding	57	54.3	42	40.0	−15
Total institutions	105	100.0%	105	100.0%	0
Total number of completions	68		307		+239
Average number of completions	3.4[a] 1.4[b]		5.8[a] 4.9[b]		+2.4[a] +3.5[b]
Median number of completions	2.8[a] 0		3.6[a] 2.9[b]		+0.8[a] +2.0[b]
Range—highest	10		23		+13
Range—lowest	1		1		0

[a] "None" category excluded in computation
[b] "None" category included in computation

Chapter 7

The Faculty

Earlier studies of professional preparation programs focused primarily on program characteristics and provided only limited data on faculty characteristics. They noted that there were too few professors, resulting in very heavy loads, and that there appeared to be a rather heavy emphasis on part-time staff members, particularly within institutions offering less than a doctorate.

Given the past decade's sizable increases in educational administration program enrollments and in the number of students completing graduate degrees in educational administration, the Commission expected to find a significant increase in the number of faculty as well. This chapter will document the extent of this increase and will provide comprehensive data on the characteristics of full-time and part-time faculty members. Information will be presented on resources available to the professorial staff, such as travel funds and office space. A special section will examine the professors' perceptions of what is likely to be adequately and inadequately covered in administrator preparation programs and of significant issues currently facing the school superintendent.

Full-Time Faculty Members

The term *full-time* needs further clarification. For purposes of this publication it refers to faculty members who hold rank in a department of educational administration and who devote 100 percent, or at least a major portion, of their time to teaching, research, and service in this area. It implies that a professor is employed on a full-time basis by the university or by a university-related agency such as a research and development center. It does not mean that he teaches *only* courses in educational administration. He may, because of joint appointments or other reasons, teach one or more courses or exert research and service efforts in fields not directly connected with educational administration. However, he must spend the major portion of his efforts in the field of educational administration to be counted as a full-time faculty member. It follows from this definition that *part-time* faculty members are those who (a) are not employed on a full-time basis by a university or university-related agency or (b) devote less than a major portion of their total effort to the field of educational administration. Part-time personnel include professors from other departments who teach an occasional course in educational administration and practicing administrators who may be employed during the semester or summer session to teach one or more courses.

Number

The numbers of faculty members devoting 100 percent, or a major portion, of their time to teaching, research, and service in the area of educational administration in 1960-61 and again in 1969-70 are summarized in Table 56. The last column shows the changes that occurred during the decade. The table also contrasts growth in public and private institutions.

In publicly supported institutions the number of full-time faculty tripled during the past decade, according to one measure. The typical department grew from about two full-time professors in 1960-61 to six in 1969-70. "Typical" in this instance is defined by the median. These data suggest that the one-man department of educational administration has passed into history. The dramatic growth during a relatively short period of time permitted the employment of specialists, something which many writers in the field of educational administration had recommended.

The total faculty size for public institutions responding grew from 290 to 717. The AASA Commission estimates that the total number of full-time professors of educational administration in 1969-70, in all public institutions, was 850.

There was considerable variation. In 1969-70 three (2.4 percent) of the public institutions had no full-time faculty members in school administration, while five (4.1 percent) had 15 to 19. None reported 20 or more full-time professors. One in eight public institutions had a full-time staff of 10 or more. A majority (over 56 percent) had more than five full-time faculty members in 1969-70.

Private institutions exhibited a similar growth in full-time professorial staff in educational administration. The median number of staff in private institutions grew from 2 in 1960-61 to 5 in 1969-70, an increase of 150 percent. The total number of staff increased from 119 in 1960-61 to 242 in 1969-70. The range in number of staff members in privately endowed schools in 1969-70 was from one to 27. All private institutions had one or more full-time faculty in educational administration. Two (4.8 percent) indicated a faculty size of 20 or more. In general, however, the typical department of educational

TABLE 56. Number of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration, 1960-61 and 1969-70

Number of full-time faculty members	Public institutions				Private institutions				All types				Change from 1960–61 to 1969–70
	1960–61		1969–70		1960–61		1969–70		1960–61		1969–70		
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.
None	17	15.0%	3	2.4%	3	8.6%	0	0 %	20	13.5%	3	1.8%	−17
1–4	81	71.7	51	41.5	26	74.3	20	47.6	107	72.3	71	43.0	−36
5–9	13	11.5	54	43.9	3	8.6	18	42.9	16	10.8	72	43.6	+ 56
10–14	2	1.8	10	8.1	2	5.7	2	4.8	4	2.7	12	7.3	+ 8
15–19	0	0	5	4.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3.0	+ 5
20 or more	0	0	0	0	1	2.9	2	4.8	1	0.7	2	1.2	+ 1
Totals	113	100.0%	123	100.0%	35	100.1%	42	100.1%	148	100.0%	165	99.9%	+ 17
Institutions responding	113	90.4%	123	98.4%	35	81.4%	42	97.7%	148	88.1%	165	98.2%	+ 17
Institutions not responding	12	9.6	2	1.6	8	18.6	1	2.3	20	11.9	3	1.8	− 17
Total institutions	125	100.0%	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	0
Total number of faculty members	290		717		119		242		409		959		+550
Average number of faculty members	2.5[a] 2.9[b]		5.6[a] 5.6[b]		3.4[a] 3.7[b]		5.8[a] 5.8[b]		2.7[a] 3.1[b]		5.6[a] 5.7[b]		+2.9[a] +2.6[b]
Median number of faculty members	2.0[a] 2.0[b]		6.0[a] 6.0[b]		2.0[a] 3.0[b]		5.0[a] 5.0[b]		2.0[a] 2.0[b]		6.0[a] 6.0[b]		+4.0[a] +4.0[b]
Range—highest	14		18		20		27		20		27		+7
Range—lowest	1		1		1		1		1		1		0

[a] "None" category excluded in computation
[b] "None" category included in computation

administration in a private institution had about as many full-time professors as did its counterpart in a public university.

The total number of full-time professors of educational administration in public and private institutions responding in 1969-70 was 959. Including institutions not participating in this survey or not responding to this question would bring the grand total to about 1,050, the Commission estimates.

Institutions with no full-time professors of educational administration dropped from 13.5 percent of the total in 1960-61 to only 1.8 percent in 1969-70. Previous research efforts found that it is difficult to operate a quality preparation program without full-time faculty members in educational administration. If one were seeking ways to reduce the number of institutions with preparation programs in an effort to minimize the possibility of an oversupply of inadequately trained personnel, perhaps the first step would be to eliminate the programs in those institutions with fewer than five full-time faculty members in educational administration, which represent almost 45 percent of the institutions responding.

Academic Preparation

The preparation of professors as measured by highest academic degree earned is summarized in Table 57. Better than nine out of ten held a doctorate, with more having earned an Ed.D. than a Ph.D. There was little change in the preparation level of regular faculty members in educational administration during the past decade; almost 97 percent of the full-time professors in public and about 95 percent in private institutions held a doctorate in 1960-61 as well as in 1969-70. No person with only a baccalaureate degree was employed as a full-time staff member in educational administration in either year. Very small percentages taught with only a master's or two-year graduate degree.

Professorial Rank

The distribution of full-time faculty in educational administration by professorial rank is summarized in Table 58. For all types of institutions, 45.8 percent of the faculty in 1969-70 held the rank of full professor, 32.7 percent associate professor, 18.8 percent assistant professor, and 1.9 percent instructor. The rank of instructor had almost disappeared in publicly supported universities, but over 5 percent of the faculty in private institutions were instructors.

Age

An analysis of the age distribution of full-time faculty in educational administration shows that the

TABLE 57. Highest Academic Degrees Held by Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration, 1960-61 and 1969-70

Highest degree	Faculty members holding given degrees in											
	Public institutions in				Private institutions in				All types of institutions in			
	1960–61		1969–70		1960–61		1969–70		1960–61		1969–70	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Baccalaureate degree only	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %
Master's	6	2.2	15	2.1	3	2.5	6	2.5	9	2.3	21	2.2
Two-year	4	1.4	8	1.1	2	1.7	2	0.8	6	1.5	10	1.0
Total doctorate	168	96.4	698	96.7	113	95.0	225	94.9	381	96.0	923	96.2
Ed.D.	157	56.5	420	58.2	68	57.1	131	55.3	225	56.7	551	57.5
Ph.D.	111	40.0	278	38.5	45	37.8	94	39.7	156	39.3	372	38.8
Other	0	0	1	0.1	1	0.8	4	1.7	1	0.3	5	0.5
Total	278	100.1%	722	100.0%	119	100.0%	237	99.9%	397	100.1%	959	99.9%
Institutions responding	100	80.0%	120	96.0%	33	76.7%	42	97.7%	133	79.2%	162	96.4%
Institutions not responding	8	6.4	2	1.6	7	16.3	1	2.3	15	8.9	3	1.8
Institutions with no full-time faculty members in educational administration	17	13.6	3	2.4	3	7.0	0	0	20	11.9	3	1.8
Total institutions	125	100.0%	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%	168	100.0%

TABLE 58. Rank Distribution of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration

Rank	Faculty holding given rank in					
	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Instructor	5	0.7%	13	5.4%	18	1.9%
Assistant professor	126	17.9	52	21.5	178	18.8
Associate professor	231	32.8	78	32.2	309	32.7
Full professor	336	47.7	97	40.1	433	45.8
Total faculty members	704	100.0%	242	100.0%	946	100.0%
Institutions responding	121	96.8%	42	97.7%	163	97.0%
Institutions not responding	1	0.8	1	2.3	2	1.2
Institutions with no full-time faculty members in educational administration	3	2.4	0	0	3	1.8
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%

under-30 group accounted for less than 2 percent of the total. At the other end of the spectrum, the 60 and over group accounted for 14.1 percent. The modal age group was 40 to 49, 38.8 percent of the professors being within this range. The average age was 47.6, and the median age 45.8. The typical full-time professor in 1969-70 was almost 46 or 48, depending upon which measure of central tendency is accepted as the indicator of the typical.

There appeared to be only minor variations in age among full-time faculty in public and private institutions. These data are summarized in Table 59.

A picture of the youngest and oldest full-time faculty members in educational administration in

1969-70 can be gleaned from Tables 60 and 61. The age range for the youngest was from 23 to 58. These data suggest that in almost 4 percent of the institutions the faculty was relatively old, for they reported the "youngest" as age 50 or over. The so-called "young man" of the full-time staff was more likely to be about age 36.

The age range for the oldest faculty was from 44 to 72. One institution had a full-time faculty member 80 years of age. The typical "old man" was approximately 60. It must be pointed out that more than one-half of the institutions (56.1 percent) stated that the oldest faculty member in educational administration was age 60 or older.

TABLE 59. Age Distribution of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration

Age	Faculty of given ages in					
	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Under 30	12	1.7%	5	2.2%	17	1.8%
30–39	155	21.5	54	23.6	209	22.0
40–49	294	40.8	74	32.3	368	38.8
50–59	156	21.7	65	28.4	221	23.3
60 and over	103	14.3	31	13.5	134	14.1
Totals	720	100.0%	229	100.0%	949	100.0%
Institutions responding	114	91.2%	38	88.4%	152	90.5%
Institutions not responding	8	6.4	5	11.6	13	7.8
Institutions with no full-time faculty members in educational administration	3	2.4	0	0	3	1.8
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.1%
Average age	47.5		47.8		47.6	
Median age	45.6		46.6		45.8	

TABLE 60. Age of Youngest Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration

Age	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Under 30	3	2.6%	1	2.6%	4	2.6%
30–34	39	33.9	12	30.8	51	33.1
35–39	44	38.3	10	25.6	54	35.1
40–44	20	17.4	8	20.5	28	18.2
45–49	7	6.1	4	10.3	6	3.9
50 or over	2	1.7	4	10.3	6	3.9
Totals	115	100.0%	39	100.1%	154	100.0%
Institutions responding	115	92.0%	39	90.7%	154	91.7%
Institutions not responding	7	5.6	4	9.3	11	6.5
Institutions without full-time faculty members in educational administration	3	2.4	0	0	3	1.8
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average age	36.8		38.8		37.3	
Median age	35.8		37.5		36.1	
Range—highest	55		58		58	
Range—lowest	26		23		23	

TABLE 61. Age of Oldest Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration

Age	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Under 45	3	26.0%	1	2.5%	4	2.6%
45–49	8	7.0	3	7.5	11	7.1
50–54	15	13.0	6	15.0	21	13.5
55–59	23	20.0	9	22.5	32	20.6
60–64	34	29.6	10	25.0	44	28.4
65 and over	32	27.8	11	27.5	43	27.7
Totals	115	100.0%	40	100.0%	155	99.9%
Institutions responding	115	92.0%	40	93.0%	155	92.3%
Institutions not responding	7	5.6	3	7.0	10	6.0
Institutions without full-time faculty members in educational administration	3	2.4	0	0	3	1.8
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.1%
Average age	59.5		59.1		59.4	
Median age	60.3		59.8		60.1	
Range—highest	70[a]		72		72[a]	
Range—lowest	44		44		44	

[a] One institution had a faculty member 80 years old.

TABLE 62. Sex of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration

Sex	Faculty members in					
	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Male	691	99.1%	218	93.6%	909	97.7%
Female	6	0.9	15	6.4	21	2.3
Total	697	100.0%	233	100.0%	930	100.0%
Institutions responding	120	96.0%	41	95.3%	161	95.8%
Institutions not responding	2	1.6	2	4.7	4	2.4
Institutions with no full-time faculty members in educational administration	3	2.4	0	0	3	1.8
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%

Sex

The professorship in school administration is pretty much a man's world, as is the superintendency. Almost 98 percent of the professors in 1969-70 were men. There were more full-time women faculty in educational administration in private institutions than in public institutions. These data are summarized in Table 62.

Experience

The number of years of professional experience of full-time educational administration faculty is indicated in Table 63. If the median is taken as an indicator of the "typical" pattern, then approximately six years of experience was typical. About one-fourth (24.3 percent) of the faculty members had two years or less of experience as professors. At the

TABLE 63. Professional Experience of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration

Years of teaching experience	Faculty members in					
	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1	73	10.7%	25	11.1%	98	10.8%
2	82	12.0	40	17.8	122	13.5
3	86	12.6	23	10.2	109	12.0
4	69	10.1	21	9.3	90	9.9
5–9	148	21.8	49	21.8	197	21.7
10–14	97	14.2	27	12.0	124	13.7
15 or more	127	18.6	40	17.8	167	18.4
Totals	682	100.0%	225	100.0%	907	100.0%
Institutions responding	120	96.0%	41	95.3%	161	95.8%
Institutions not responding	2	1.6	2	4.7	4	2.4
Institutions without full-time faculty members in educational administration	3	2.4	0	0	3	1.8
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average years of experience	7.5		7.1		7.4	
Median years of experience	6.1		5.4		5.9	

TABLE 64. Percentage of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration with Administrative Experience

Percentage	Institutions reporting given percentages of faculty with					
	No administrative experience		Principalship experience		Superintendency experience	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
0%	111	68.9%	33	20.5%	7	4.3%
1–9	1	0.6	2	1.2	0	0
10–19	19	11.8	7	4.3	7	4.3
20–29	12	7.5	27	16.8	18	11.2
30–39	5	3.1	27	16.8	12	7.5
40–49	5	3.1	14	8.7	16	9.9
50–59	4	2.5	22	13.7	22	13.7
60% or more	4	2.5	29	18.0	79	49.1
Totals	161	100.0%	161	100.0%	161	100.0%
Institutions responding	161	95.8%	161	95.8%	161	95.8%
Institutions not responding	4	2.4	4	2.4	4	2.4
Institutions without full-time faculty members in educational administration	3	1.8	3	1.8	3	1.8
Total institutions	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average percentage with experience	28.4%[a] 8.8 [b]		41.7%[a] 33.1 [b]		51.2%[a] 49.0 [b]	
Median percentage with experience	23.6 [a] 0 [b]		40.1 [a] 33.4 [b]		60.1 [a] 58.5 [b]	

[a] "0%" category excluded in computation
[b] "0%" category included in computation

TABLE 65. Academic Year Salary for Full-Time Faculty Members, 1969-70

Salary	Faculty in					
	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Under $10,000	1	0.1%	5	2.8%	6	0.7%
$10,000–14,999	153	21.9	54	30.2	207	23.6
15,000–19,999	359	51.4	73	40.8	432	49.2
20,000–24,999	153	21.9	25	14.0	178	20.3
25,000–29,999	32	4.6	16	8.9	48	5.5
30,000 and over	1	0.1	6	3.4	7	0.8
Total	699	100.0%	179	100.1%	878	100.1%
Institutions responding	119	95.2%	36	83.7%	145	86.3%
Institutions not responding	3	2.4	7	16.3	20	11.9
Institutions with no full-time faculty members in educational administration	3	2.4	0	0	3	1.8
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average salary	$17,961.40		$17,739.40		$17,915.70	
Median salary	17,728.80		17,122.30		17,621.00	

TABLE 66. Highest Twelve-Month Salaries Paid to Full-Time Faculty Members, 1969-70

Highest salary	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Under $14,000	1	1.0%	2	8.0%	3	2.4%
$14,000–15,999	5	4.9	2	8.0	7	5.5
16,000–17,999	8	7.8	4	16.0	12	9.4
18,000–19,999	28	27.5	6	24.0	34	26.8
20,000–21,999	23	22.5	2	8.0	25	19.7
22,000–23,999	13	12.7	2	8.0	15	11.8
24,000–25,999	13	12.7	4	16.0	17	13.4
26,000–27,999	4	3.9	0	0	4	3.1
28,000–29,999	4	3.9	1	4.0	5	3.9
30,000 and over	3	2.9	2	8.0	5	3.9
Totals	102	99.8%	25	100.0%	127	99.0%
Institutions responding	102	31.6%	25	58.1%	127	75.6%
Institutions not responding	20	16.0	18	41.9	38	22.6
Institutions with no full-time faculty members in educational administration	3	2.4	0	0	3	1.8
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average salary	$21,372.50		$20,680.00		$21,236.20	
Median salary	20,825.10		19,665.70		20,639.00	
Range—highest	30,255.00		40,000.00		40,000.00	
Range—lowest	13,800.00		14,000.00		13,800.00	

other extreme almost one in five (18.4 percent) had 15 or more years of experience.

Most of the full-time faculty in educational administration had experience as school administrators. It was the unusual institution where a majority of the faculty had had no administrative experience. In

TABLE 67. Lowest Twelve-Month Salaries Paid to Full-Time Faculty Members, 1969-70

Lowest salary	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Under $10,000	1	1.0%	3	11.5%	4	3.1%
$10,000–10,999	1	1.0	2	7.7	3	2.3
11,000–11,999	4	3.9	2	7.7	6	4.7
12,000–12,999	11	10.8	7	26.9	18	14.1
13,000–13,999	19	18.6	2	7.7	21	16.4
14,000–14,999	24	23.5	3	11.5	27	21.1
15,000 and over	42	41.2	7	26.9	49	38.3
Total	102	100.0%	26	99.9%	128	100.0%
Institutions responding	102	81.6%	26	60.5%	128	76.2%
Institutions not responding	20	16.0	17	39.5	37	22.0
Institutions without full-time faculty members in educational administration	3	2.4	0	0	3	1.8
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average salary	$14,303.90		$13,038.50		$14,046.90	
Median salary	14,644.80		12,927.60		14,462	
Range—highest	21,300		20,000		21,300	
Range—lowest	9,600		6,350		6,350	

almost one-half of the institutions, 60 percent or more of the faculty had been superintendents. In the typical (median) institution, one-third of the faculty had experience in the principalship and almost 60 percent in the superintendency. These data are shown in Table 64.

Salary

Academic year salary exceeded $15,000 for over three-fourths of the full-time professors in 1969-70. Less than one percent earned $30,000 or more. The median salary was $17,621, and the average was $17,915.70. These data appear in Table 65.

The highest and lowest 12-month salaries paid to full-time faculty members in 1969-70 are presented in Tables 66 and 67. The highest salaries reported ranged from $13,800 to $40,000. The average of the highest 12-month salaries was $21,236.20, and the median was $20,639. The lowest 12-month salaries reported ranged from the very low figure of $6,350 to $21,300. The average of the lowest 12-month salaries was $14,046.90, and the median was $14,462. It can be said that the typical 12-month salary ranged from a low median figure of $14,462 to a high median figure of $20,639.

Specialization

The increase in number of full-time faculty allowed a higher degree of specialization. The various specializations of faculty members in 1969-70 are summarized in Table 68. More than half of the institutions reported professors with expertise and concentration of efforts in school finance, general administration, and administrative theory; about one-third had specialists in school law and educational facilities. Other popular areas of specialization included personnel, research and statistics, higher education, and curriculum and instruction. Less than 10 percent of the institutions had educational administration faculty members who focused on computer technology and systems, public relations, human relations, or cognate fields. Responses were unstructured, and the total number of specializations mentioned by the 153 institutions responding was 42. The largest number of professors appeared to specialize in the fields of school finance, general administration, and administrative theory, in that order. Some would question whether "general" administration could be called a "specialization."

Part-Time Faculty Members

Data on professors devoting part time to teaching, research, and service in the area of school administration at the beginning and the end of the previous decade are summarized in Tables 69-71.

Number

The numbers of part-time professors did not decline, even though the full-time staff doubled during the past decade. Part-time staff in all types of in-

TABLE 68. Fields of Specialization of Full-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration

Field	Institutions reporting professors with given specialties		Professors in each field of specialization	
	No.	Percent[a]	No.	Percent[a]
School finance	83	54.2%	103	10.4%
General administration	80	52.3	197	19.9
Administrative theory	78	51.0	156	15.8
School law	56	36.6	61	6.2
School facilities	50	32.7	64	6.5
Personnel administration	38	24.8	56	5.7
Research and statistics	30	19.6	40	4.0
Higher education	22	14.4	35	3.5
Curriculum and instruction	20	13.1	25	2.5
Computer technology and systems	15	9.8	23	2.3
Public relations	10	6.5	15	1.5
Human relations	9	5.9	12	1.2
Cognate fields	5	3.3	6	0.6
Others	90	58.8	196	19.8
Totals	586		989	99.9%
Institutions responding	153	91.1%		
Institutions not responding	12	7.1		
Institutions without full-time faculty members in educational administration	3	1.8		
Total institutions	168	100.0%		
Total number of specializations	42			

[a] Based on 153 institutions responding.

TABLE 69. Number of Part-Time Faculty Members in School Administration, 1960-61 and 1969-70

Number of part-time faculty members	Public institutions				Private institutions				All types				Change from 1960–61 to 1969–70
	1960–61		1969–70		1960–61		1969–70		1960–61		1969–70		
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.
None	15	16.0%	8	6.9%	3	8.8%	3	7.9%	18	14.1%	11	7.1%	− 7
1-4	57	60.6	50	43.1	23	67.6	15	39.5	80	62.5	65	42.2	−15
5-9	18	19.1	38	32.8	6	17.6	13	34.2	24	18.8	51	33.1	+27
10–14	4	4.3	11	9.5	2	5.9	5	13.2	6	4.7	16	10.4	+10
15–19	0	0	8	6.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.2	+ 8
20 or more	0	0	1	0.9	0	0	2	5.3	0	0	3	1.9	+ 3
Totals	94	100.0%	116	100.1%	34	99.9%	38	100.1%	128	100.1%	154	99.9%	+26
Institutions responding	94	75.2%	116	92.8%	34	79.1%	38	88.4%	128	76.2%	154	91.7%	+26
Institutions not responding	31	24.8	9	7.2	9	20.9	5	11.6	40	23.8	14	8.3	−26
Total institutions	125	100.0%	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%	168	100.0%	0
Total faculty members	302		644		106		206		408		850		+442
Average number of faculty members	2.7[a] 2.4[b]		6.0[a] 5.6[b]		3.4[a] 3.1[b]		5.9[a] 5.4[b]		3.7[a] 3.2[b]		5.9[a] 5.5[b]		+2.2[a] +2.3[b]
Median number of faculty members	4.0[a] 3.0[b]		5.0[a] 4.0[b]		3.0[a] 3.0[b]		5.0[a] 5.0[b]		3.0[a] 2.0[b]		5.0[a] 4.0[b]		+2.0[a] +2.0[b]
Range—highest	14		20		12		27		14		27		+13
Range—lowest	1		1		1		1		1		1		0

[a] "None" category excluded in computation
[b] "None" category included in computation

TABLE 70. Highest Academic Degrees Held by Part-Time Faculty Members, 1960-61 and 1969-70

Highest degree	Faculty members holding given degrees in												Change from 1960–61 to 1969–70	
	Public institutions				Private institutions				All types					
	1960–61		1969–70		1960–61		1969–70		1960–61		1969–70			
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Baccalaureate	1	0.3%	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %	1	0.2%	0	0 %	–1	–0.2 %
Master's	46	15.3	27	4.3	22	19.6	24	11.2	68	16.5	51	6.1	–17	–4.0
Two year	16	5.3	33	5.3	7	6.3	15	7.0	23	5.6	48	5.7	+25	+5.8
Doctorate	237	79.0	565	90.1	83	74.1	172	80.6	320	77.7	737	87.7	+417	+97.4
Ed.D.	164	54.7	386	61.6	46	41.1	91	42.7	210	51.0	477	56.8	+267	+62.4
Ph.D.	73	24.3	179	28.5	37	33.0	81	38.0	110	26.7	260	24.5	+150	+35.0
Other	0	0	2	0.3	0	0	2	0.9	0	0	4	.5	+4	+0.9
Totals	300	99.9%	627	100.0%	112	100.0%	213	99.8%	412	100.0%	840	100.0%	428	99.9%
Institutions responding	72	57.6%	107	85.6%	29	67.4%	33	76.7%	101	60.1%	140	83.3%	+39	+23.2%
Institutions not responding	38	30.4	10	8.0	11	25.6	7	16.3	49	29.2	17	10.1	–32	–19.2
Institutions without part-time faculty members in educational administration	15	12.0	8	6.4	3	7.0	3	7.0	18	10.7	11	6.5	–7	–4.2
Total institutions	125	100.0%	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%	168	99.9%	0	0%

TABLE 71. Percentage of Part-Time Faculty Members in Educational Administration with Administrative Experience

Percentage	Institutions reporting given percentages of faculty with					
	No administrative experience		Principalship experience		Superintendency experience	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
0%	104	75.4%	32	23.2%	24	17.4%
1-9	0	0	1	0.7	1	0.7
10-19	4	2.9	1	0.7	7	5.1
20-29	6	4.3	15	10.9	14	10.1
30-39	9	6.5	14	10.1	12	8.7
40-49	1	0.7	7	5.1	8	5.8
50-59	5	3.6	27	19.6	23	16.7
60-69	2	1.4	16	11.6	13	9.4
70-79	1	0.7	9	6.5	5	3.6
80-89	0	0	4	2.9	5	3.6
90-100	6	4.3	12	8.7	26	18.8
Totals	138	99.8%	138	100.0%	138	99.9%
Institutions responding	138	82.1%	138	82.1%	138	82.1%
Institutions not responding	19	11.3	19	11.3	19	11.3
Institutions with no part-time faculty members in educational administration	11	6.5	11	6.5	11	6.5
Total institutions	168	99.9%	168	99.9%	168	99.9%

stitutions grew from 408 to 850 between 1960-61 and 1969-70. The number of part-time personnel per responding department ranged from a low of only one to a high of 27 in 1969-70. The AASA Commission estimates that, including institutions not responding to this survey, there were about 1,000 part-time

TABLE 72. Travel Funds Allocated to Educational Administration Professors, 1969-70

Total for travel	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Under $1,000	55	57.3%	12	44.4%	67	54.5%
$1,000-1,999	28	29.2	5	18.5	33	26.8
2,000-2,999	5	5.2	5	18.5	10	8.1
3,000-3,999	4	4.2	3	11.1	7	5.7
4,000-4,999	1	1.0	1	3.7	2	1.6
5,000-5,999	1	1.0	1	3.7	2	1.6
6,000-6,999	1	1.0	0	0	1	0.8
7,000-7,999	0	0	0	0	0	0
8,000-8,999	1	1.0	0	0	1	0.8
9,000-9,999	0	0	0	0	0	0
Over $10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	96	99.9%	27	99.9%	123	99.9%
Institutions responding	96	76.8%	27	62.8%	123	73.2%
Institutions not responding	29	23.2	16	37.2	45	26.8
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average amount	$1,260.40		$1,722.20		$1,361.80	
Median amount	881.80		1,399		925.40	
Range—highest	8,000		5,500		8,000	
Range—lowest	60		200		60	

TABLE 73. Travel Funds Allocated per Professor

Amount per professor	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
None	0	0 %	0	0 %	0	0 %
Under $200	67	63.8	9	28.1	76	55.5
$200-299	15	14.3	8	25.0	23	16.8
300-399	12	11.4	5	15.6	17	12.4
400-499	2	1.9	1	3.1	3	2.2
500-599	3	2.9	6	18.8	9	6.6
600-699	1	1.0	0	0	1	0.7
Over $700	5	4.8	3	9.4	8	5.8
Totals	105	100.1%	32	100.0%	137	100.0%
Institutions responding	105	84.0%	32	74.4%	137	81.5%
Institutions not responding	20	16.0	11	25.6	31	18.5
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average amount	$237		$347		$263	
Median amount	158		293		182	
Range—highest	1,500		1,000		1,500	
Range—lowest	33		35		33	

personnel engaged in teaching, research, and service in the area of school administration in 1969-70. The total of part-time and full-time faculty is estimated to have been about 2,050.

TABLE 74. Additional Travel Money from Special Projects

Amount of additional travel money	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
None	20	23.0%	10	47.6%	30	27.8%
Under $5,000	61	70.1	11	52.4	72	66.7
$5,000-9,999	3	3.4	0	0	3	2.8
10,000-14,999	1	1.1	0	0	1	0.9
15,000-19,999	1	1.1	0	0	1	0.9
20,000-24,999	0	0	0	0	0	0
Over $25,000	1	1.1	0	0	1	0.9
Totals	87	99.8%	21	100.0%	108	100.0%
Institutions responding	87	69.6%	21	48.8%	108	64.3%
Institutions not responding	38	30.4	22	51.2	60	35.7
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average amount	$2,672.40		$1,309.50		$2,407.40	
Median amount	1,967.20		454.50		1,701.40	
Range—highest	14,285		4,000		14,285	
Range—lowest	100		400		100	

Academic Preparation and Administrative Experience

As to the preparation level of part-time personnel employed in 1969-70, 56.8 percent had an Ed.D. and 34.5 percent had a Ph.D. Thus 91.3 percent had a doctorate, as compared to approximately 96 percent of full-time personnel. Part-time personnel employed in 1969-70 were more likely to have a doctorate than those employed in 1960-61. Over one in five (22.3 percent) in 1960-61 had no doctor's degree. These data are summarized in Table 70.

As indicated in Table 71, most part-time educational administration professors had administrative experience of some type.

Resources Available to Faculty

Travel Funds

Data on travel funds are analyzed in Tables 72-74. University travel funds were relatively sparse. As shown in Table 72, over one-half (54.5 percent) of the institutions allocated less than $1,000 for travel for all professors in the educational administration department in 1969-70. Over 80 percent of the institutions provided less than $2,000. The median amount for the year was $925.40, and the average $1,361.80.

When travel funds are analyzed further in terms of dollars available per professor in 1969-70, it becomes evident that over one-half of the professors received less than $200. The median amount per professor was $182, and the average $263. Private institutions, where the median amount was $293, provided more for travel per professor than did public universities, where the median was only $158. Some institutions allocated as little as $33 per professor, others as much as $1,500. This very wide range tends to distort the average and make the median the better indicator of typical practice.

The saving grace for professorial travel was the additional money available from special projects. However, 23 percent of the public and 47.6 percent of the private institutions received no additional travel supplements. Most often such supplements amounted to less than $5,000 per institution. Again a wide variation was evident; the supplementary amounts ranged from as little as $100 to as much as $14,285. The median amount for all types of institutions was $1,701.40. If the median is accepted as the indicator of the "typical," the typical public institution received more than four times as much as the typical private institution in additional travel money from special projects.

Secretarial Assistance

Professors need secretaries to accomplish certain parts of their responsibilities. However, the secretarial resources for professors appeared to be very limited. As shown in Tables 75 and 76, the typical department of educational administration had about two secretaries, each of whom did work for about three professors. The correspondence and writing load of professors did not appear to be adequately recognized as late as 1969-70.

TABLE 75. Number of Secretaries in Educational Administration Departments

Number of secretaries	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
None	1	0.9%	0	0 %	1	0.7%
1	34	31.5	11	25.6	45	29.8
2	31	28.7	10	23.3	41	27.2
3	11	10.2	11	25.6	22	14.6
4	13	12.0	7	16.3	20	13.2
5–9	16	14.8	3	7.0	19	12.6
10–14	2	1.9	1	2.3	3	2.0
15 and over	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	108	100.0%	43	100.0%	151	101.0%
Institutions responding	108	86.4%	43	100.0%	151	89.9%
Institutions not responding	17	13.6	0	0	17	10.1
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average number of secretaries	2.9		2.9		2.9	
Median number of secretaries	2.0		2.0		2.0	

TABLE 76. Ratio of Professors to Secretaries

Professors per secretary	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1	6	5.8%	4	10.0%	10	7.0%
2	26	25.2	9	22.5	35	24.5
3	22	21.4	12	30.0	34	23.8
4	24	23.3	8	20.0	32	22.4
5	8	7.8	4	10.0	12	8.4
6 or more	17	16.5	3	7.5	20	14.0
Totals	103	100.0%	40	100.0%	143	100.1%
Institutions responding	103	82.4%	40	93.0%	143	85.2%
Institutions not responding	22	17.6	3	7.0	25	14.9
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.1%
Average number of professors per secretary	5.0		3.0		4.5	
Median number of professors per secretary	3.0		3.0		3.0	
Range—highest	20		7		20	
Range—lowest	1		1		1	

Office Space

The prevailing pattern in 1969-70 was one professor per office. In one out of eight institutions, however, two professors shared a single office. In almost 5 percent of the institutions three or more professors were housed in a single office. Crowding in public institutions appeared to be more severe than in private ones. The variation was large, ranging from one professor per office to nine professors per office! Data on office space can be found in Table 77.

Perception of Issues Facing the School Superintendent

The respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions of issues facing the school superintendent. By and large the respondents were professors who served as chairmen of educational administration departments, rather than deans of colleges of education or university presidents. The results shown in Tables 78-80, therefore, reflect the ideas of pro-

TABLE 77. Office Space for Professors of Educational Administration

Ratio (professors per office)	Public institutions		Private institutions		All types	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
1	97	81.5%	35	83.3%	132	82.0%
2	16	13.4	5	11.9	21	13.0
3	3	2.5	1	2.4	4	2.5
4	1	0.8	1	2.4	2	1.2
More than 4	2	1.7	0	0	2	1.2
Totals	119	99.9%	42	100.0%	161	99.9%
Institutions responding	119	95.2%	42	97.7%	161	95.8%
Institutions not responding	6	4.8	1	2.3	7	4.2
Total institutions	125	100.0%	43	100.0%	168	100.0%
Average number of professors per office	1.3		1.3		1.3	
Median number of professors per office	1		1		1	
Range—highest	9		4		9	
Range—lowest	1		1		1	

fessors who may or may not have consulted their colleagues in responding.

In order of frequency, professors indicated the following issues as being covered adequately in administrator preparation programs in 1969-70: financing schools; growing federal involvement in education; school staff relations, such as negotiations and strikes; reorganization of small districts; innovations; rapidly increasing student enrollments; and social-cultural issues, such as race relations, integration, and segregation. The rankings are presented in Table 78.

Issues of importance that were neglected but should have been included in administrator preparation programs, according to the professors, were the use of drugs in schools; assessing educational outcomes; growing pressure for public support of nonpublic schools; student unrest or activism; and greater visibility of the superintendent. These are ranked in Table 79.

The questionnaire asked the respondents to indicate the significance they attached to each of 18 issues facing the superintendent. The resultant rankings are presented in Table 80. An earlier report by this Commission *(The American School Superintendent)* showed the ranking of these same issues by superintendents of schools in 1969-70. Superintendents ranked educational financing as the number one issue; professors rated this the number two concern. The social-cultural issues confronting the schools were ranked number one by professors; superintendents gave these concerns rank number 11.

In general, there was a positive correlation between the ranking of significant issues by professors and by superintendents in the field. The Spearman-Rho rank order correlation was computed to be a positive 0.475, considered significant at the 5 percent but not the one percent level of confidence. As indicated in the earlier report, there was disagreement among superintendents in districts of various sizes as to the emphasis each issue deserved. For example, reorganization of small districts into larger units was ranked seventh by superintendents. This relatively high ranking reflects the large number of superintendents in districts with enrollments of less than 3,000. Superintendents in this group gave the issue a number two or three ranking, whereas those serving the largest districts placed district reorganization at the bottom of the list.

There was a higher positive correlation between rankings of professors and superintendents serving districts with enrollments of 25,000 or more than between those of professors and superintendents as a whole. The Spearman-Rho rank order correlation was computed to be a positive 0.745, which was significant at the one percent level of confidence. In contrast, the correlation of rankings was a positive 0.267 between professors and superintendents in districts with enrollments of less than 300. This correlation was so low that it was not considered significant at the 5 percent level. In general, it can be concluded that professors are closer to superintendents in urban areas than to those in very small or rural districts in their perception of significant issues.

Summary

The number of full-time professors in departments of educational administration was two and one-half to three times greater in 1969-70 than in 1960-61. The typical department had about six full-time members in 1969-70, as compared to two in 1960-61.

TABLE 78. Issues Thought To Be Adequately Covered in Administrator Preparation Programs

Issue	Rank
Financing schools	1
Growing federal involvement in education	2
School staff relations, such as negotiations and strikes	3
Reorganization of small districts	4
Innovations	5
Rapidly increasing student enrollments	6
Social-cultural issues, such as race relations, integration, segregation	7

TABLE 79. Neglected Issues That Should Be Included in Administrator Preparation Programs

Issue	Rank
Use of drugs in schools	1
Assessing educational outcomes	2
Growing pressure for public support of nonpublic schools	3
Student unrest or activism	4
Greater visibility of the superintendent	5

There did not appear to be any significant disparity between the sizes of full-time staff in public universities and private institutions. The one-man department of educational administration had all but disappeared. It is estimated that the number of full-time professors of educational administration was about 1,050. About 45 percent of the responding institutions had fewer than five full-time professors in educational administration; the Commission questions the value of continuing such programs.

Relatively minor changes in the academic qualifications of professors in educational administration occurred during the 1960's. About 96 percent of the full-time professors held a doctor's degree in 1969-70—the same percentage as in 1960-61.

The typical professor of educational administration in 1969-70 was likely to be about 46 years old. More than three-fourths held the rank of associate professor or full professor. The professorship in educational administration remained a man's world. Most full-time faculty members had spent six or more years teaching. The majority also had administrative experience. The typical professor received a 12-month salary falling somewhere between $14,462 and $20,639. The highest salary reported was $40,000.

More than 40 areas of specialization were reported for professors in educational administration. School finance, general administration, administrative theory, school law, school facilities, and personnel administration were the most common ones.

TABLE 80. Professors' Ranking of Significant Issues Facing the School Superintendent

Issue	Rank
Social-cultural issues, such as race relations, integration, or segregation	1
Financing schools to meet increasing current expenditures and capital outlays	2
Issues in school staff relations, such as negotiations, strikes, sanctions, or some form of teacher militancy	3
Innovations or demands for new ways of teaching or operating the educational program	4
Changes in values and behavioral norms	5
Student unrest or activism, such as underground newspapers and student strikes	6
Growing federal involvement in education	7
Changing priorities in curriculum, such as introducing black studies courses or sex education, or eliminating traditional courses[a]	8
Assessing educational outcomes, such as the national assessment effort[a]	9
Reorganization of small districts into larger units of administration[a]	10
Increasing attacks on the superintendent	11
Use of drugs in the schools	12
Decentralization of large districts into smaller units of administration	13
Greater visibility of the superintendent	14
Caliber of persons assigned to or removed from local boards of education	15
Rapidly increasing student enrollments[b]	16
Growing pressure for public support of nonpublic schools[b]	17
Caliber of responsibilities assigned to or removed from local boards of education[b]	18

[a] A virtual tie ranking for these three issues; differences in value were very small.

[b] A virtual tie ranking for these three issues as well; differences in value were very small.

Whether "general administration" should be recognized as a specialization is open to question.

The number of part-time faculty in educational administration more than doubled during the 1960's. The median number grew from 2 in 1960-61 to 5 in 1969-70. In gross numbers there were 840 part-time faculty members in 1969-70 in the institutions reporting. It is estimated that about 1,000 part-time personnel were employed in all institutions. The total of full- and part-time faculty members was estimated at about 2,050.

More than 91 percent of the part-time faculty members had an earned doctorate. Among both full-time and part-time faculty members, more held an Ed.D. than a Ph.D. The academic preparation of part-time faculty members increased somewhat during the 1960's. Most part-time faculty members had administrative experience.

The typical university provided a professor less than $200 for travel in 1969-70. Private institutions tended to allocate more for professorial travel than public universities did. Travel money for professors was often supplemented by funds available in special projects. These appeared to help significantly, particularly in public institutions. There was a wide variation in travel funds among universities.

Despite the correspondence and writing load of professors, the typical department of educational administration had only two secretaries. A single secretary more often than not provided service to about three professors.

Most professors had an office of their own. In one out of eight institutions two or more professors were housed in one office. Office space seemed to be more scarce in public institutions than in private ones. One public institution reported nine professors of educational administration in one office.

The correlation of rankings of significant issues facing the school superintendency by professors and by superintendents of schools was positive and significant at the 5 percent level, but relatively low. The correlation between professors and superintendents in large school districts was much closer. The number one issue facing the superintendent, according to professors, was the social-cultural issue, covering such matters as race relations, integration, and segregation. Superintendents ranked that issue number eleven and educational finance number one.

Appendix A

Public Institutions of Higher Learning Returning AASA Questionnaire and Offering Superintendency Preparation Programs Terminating with a Doctorate

	Master's	Two-year program	Ph.D.	Ed.D.
ALABAMA				
Auburn University	X	X		X
University of Alabama	X	X	X	X
ARIZONA				
Arizona State University		X	X	X
ARKANSAS				
University of Arkansas	X	X		X
CALIFORNIA				
University of California, Berkeley	X		X	X
University of California, Los Angeles	X		X	X
COLORADO				
Colorado State (College) University	X	X		X
University of Colorado	X	X	X	X
CONNECTICUT				
University of Connecticut		X	X	
FLORIDA				
University of Florida	X	X	X	X
GEORGIA				
University of Georgia	X	X		X
IDAHO				
University of Idaho	X	X	X	X
ILLINOIS				
Illinois State University	X	X	X	X
Northern Illinois University	X	X		X
Southern Illinois University	X	X	X	
INDIANA				
Ball State Universtiy	X	X		X
Indiana State University		X	X	
Indiana University		X		X
Purdue University	X	X	X	
IOWA				
Iowa State University	X	X	X	
KANSAS				
Kansas State University	X		X	
KENTUCKY				
University of Kentucky	X	X	X	X
LOUISIANA				
Louisiana State University	X	X	X	X
MARYLAND				
University of Maryland	X	X	X	X
MICHIGAN				
Michigan State University	X	X	X	X
University of Michigan	X	X	X	X
Western Michigan University	X	X		X
MINNESOTA				
University of Minnesota	X	X	X	X
MISSISSIPPI				
Mississippi State University	X	X	X	X
University of Southern Mississippi	X	X	X	X
University of Mississippi	X	X	X	X
MISSOURI				
University of Missouri, Columbia	X	X	X	X
University of Missouri, Kansas City	X	X	X	
MONTANA				
Montana State University	X	X	X	X
University of Montana	X	X		X
NEBRASKA				
University of Nebraska, Lincoln	X	X	X	X
NEW JERSEY				
Rutgers University	X	X		X
NEW MEXICO				
New Mexico State University	X	X		X
University of New Mexico	X	X	X	X
NEW YORK				
State University of New York at Albany		X		X
NORTH CAROLINA				
North Carolina State University				X
University of North Carolina	X	X	X	X
NORTH DAKOTA				
University of North Dakota	X	X	X	X
OHIO				
Bowling Green State University	X	X	X	
Kent State University	X	X	X	
Miami University	X	X	X	X
Ohio State University	X	X	X	
Ohio University	X	X	X	
University of Akron	X	X		X
University of Cincinnati	X	X		X
University of Toledo	X	X	X	X
OKLAHOMA				
Oklahoma State University		X		X
University of Oklahoma	X	X	X	X
OREGON				
University of Oregon		X	X	X
PENNSYLVANIA				
Pennsylvania State University	X		X	X
University of Pennsylvania			X	X
SOUTH CAROLINA				
University of South Carolina	X	X	X	
SOUTH DAKOTA				
University of South Dakota	X	X		X
TENNESSEE				
Memphis State University	X	X		X
University of Tennessee	X	X		X
TEXAS				
East Texas State University	X	X	X	X
North Texas State University		X	X	X
Texas A & M University	X	X	X	
Texas Technological University	X			X
University of Houston	X			X
University of Texas		X	X	X
UTAH				
University of Utah	X	X	X	X
Utah State University	X	X		X
VIRGINIA				
College of William & Mary	X	X		X
University of Virginia	X	X	X	X
WASHINGTON				
University of Washington	X		X	X
Washington State University	X		X	X
WEST VIRGINIA				
West Virginia University	X	X		X
WISCONSIN				
University of Wisconsin, Madison	X	X	X	
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee	X	X	X	

Appendix B

Public Institutions of Higher Learning Returning AASA Questionnaire and Offering Superintendency Preparation Programs Terminating with Less than a Doctorate

	Master's	Two-year program
ALABAMA		
Livingston University	X	
ALASKA		
University of Alaska	X	X
ARKANSAS		
Arkansas State University	X	X
CALIFORNIA		
California State College at Long Beach	X	
Chico State College	X	
Fresno State College	X	X
San Francisco State College	X	X
San Jose State College	X	X
COLORADO		
Western State College	X	X
DELAWARE		
University of Delaware	X	X
IDAHO		
Idaho State University	X	X
ILLINOIS		
Eastern Illinois University	X	X
Western Illinois University	X	X
IOWA		
University of Northern Iowa	X	X
KANSAS		
Fort Hays Kansas State College	X	X
Kansas State Teachers College	X	X
Wichita State University	X	X
KENTUCKY		
Morehead State University	X	X
Murray State University	X	X
Western Kentucky University	X	X
MASSACHUSETTS		
State College, Bridgewater	X	
MICHIGAN		
Central Michigan University	X	X
Eastern Michigan University	X	X
MINNESOTA		
Mankato State College	X	
MISSOURI		
Central Missouri State College	X	X
NEBRASKA		
University of Nebraska, Omaha	X	X
NEVADA		
University of Nevada, Las Vegas	X	X
University of Nevada, Reno	X	X
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
University of New Hampshire	X	
NEW MEXICO		
Eastern New Mexico University	X	X
New Mexico Highlands University	X	
Western New Mexico University	X	
NEW YORK		
City University of New York		X
NORTH CAROLINA		
Appalachian State University	X	X
East Carolina University	X	X
Western Carolina University	X	X
NORTH DAKOTA		
North Dakota State University	X	
RHODE ISLAND		
Rhode Island College	X	X
TENNESSEE		
East Tennessee State University	X	
Middle Tennessee State University	X	
Tennessee Technological University	X	
TEXAS		
Sam Houston State University		X
Southwest Texas State University	X	X
Stephen F. Austin University	X	X
Texas A & I University		X
Texas Southern University	X	X
West Texas State University	X	X
VERMONT		
University of Vermont	X	
WEST VIRGINIA		
Marshall University	X	X
WISCONSIN		
Wisconsin State University, Superior	X	X

Appendix C

Private Institutions of Higher Learning Returning AASA Questionnaire and Offering Superintendency Preparation Programs Terminating with a Doctorate

	Master's	Two-year program	Ph.D.	Ed.D.
CALIFORNIA				
Claremont Graduate School		X	X	
Stanford University	X		X	X
University of Southern California	X		X	X
COLORADO				
University of Denver	X			X
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
American University	X	X	X	X
Catholic University of America	X	X	X	
George Washington University	X	X		X
FLORIDA				
University of Miami	X	X	X	X
ILLINOIS				
Loyola University	X	X	X	X
Northwestern University			X	
University of Chicago	X	X	X	
INDIANA				
University of Notre Dame	X		X	
MASSACHUSETTS				
Boston College	X	X	X	X
Boston University	X	X		X
Harvard University				X
MISSOURI				
St. Louis University	X		X	
NEW YORK				
Cornell University	X		X	X
Hofstra University	X	X		X
New York University	X	X	X	X
St. John's University	X	X	X	X
Teachers College, Columbia University	X	X	X	X
University of Rochester	X	X		X
OKLAHOMA				
University of Tulsa	X	X		X
PENNSYLVANIA				
Lehigh University	X	X		X
Temple University	X	X		X
University of Pittsburgh		X	X	
TENNESSEE				
George Peabody College for Teachers	X	X	X	X
TEXAS				
Baylor University	X	X		X
UTAH				
Brigham Young University	X	X		X
WISCONSIN				
Marquette University	X		X	X

Appendix D

Private Institutions of Higher Learning Returning AASA Questionnaire and Offering Superintendency Preparation Programs Terminating with Less than a Doctorate

	Master's	Two-year program
CONNECTICUT		
Fairfield University	X	X
University of Bridgeport	X	X
FLORIDA		
Stetson University	X	
IDAHO		
The College of Idaho	X	
INDIANA		
Butler University	X	X
IOWA		
Drake University	X	X
LOUISIANA		
Tulane University	X	
MASSACHUSETTS		
Northeastern University	X	X
MINNESOTA		
College of St. Thomas	X	X
NEW JERSEY		
Seton Hall University	X	
OHIO		
University of Dayton	X	
TEXAS		
Our Lady of the Lake College	X	X
Trinity University		X

Appendix E

AASA

American Association of School Administrators

October 15, 1969

Dear Dean:

We had hoped to write a personal letter seeking your professional assistance, but unfortunately the magnitude of the study made it impossible to do so. The AASA Commission on Preparation of Professional School Administrators has been charged with the responsibility for reporting what has happened in the American school superintendency and in programs for preparing persons for the superintendency during the 1960's. A distinguished group of professors and practitioners make up the Commission and include:

Dr. Robert L. Chisholm, Division Superintendent, Arlington, Virginia
Dr. Luvern L. Cunningham, Dean, Ohio State University
Dr. Robert D. Gilberts, Superintendent, Denver, Colorado
Dr. Russell T. Gregg, Prof. and Chairman, University of Wisconsin
Dr. James A. Sensenbaugh, State Supt. of Schools, Baltimore, Maryland
Dr. Thomas T. Tucker, Jr., Prof. and Chairman, University of Nevada
Dr. E. L. Whigham, Superintendent, Miami, Florida
Dr. Donald J. Willower, Professor, Pennsylvania State University

They will report to the profession sometime in 1970.

We need your assistance to obtain data of importance to institutions of higher learning as well as to the AASA Commission. Specifically, we ask that you request the person in your institution with official responsibility for graduate educational administration programs to complete the enclosed data gathering instrument. The instrument is designed to generate data on programs in educational administration, graduate students, and faculty at your institution. Your cooperation will enhance the comprehensiveness of the research and provide valuable insights to all seeking to improve school administration in the United States.

Your early response will be appreciated. Two copies of the instrument are enclosed; please return one and keep the other for your files. Thanking you in advance for this professional courtesy, we remain

Cordially yours,

Stephen J. Knezevich
Chairman, AASA Commission on
Preparation of Professional
School Administrators

Forrest E. Conner
Executive Secretary

1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 223-9400

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

AASA COMMISSION ON PREPARATION OF PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Data Gathering Instrument
For
The Study of Graduate Preparation Programs For The School Superintendency

Form GPP1969

Directions: Please have the person with official responsibility for graduate programs in educational administration at your institution provide the information requested and mail the completed data gathering instrument to: AASA, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Estimates may be used where precise data are unavailable. The term "superintendent" refers to all chief executive officers of school districts regardless of the local or state title preference. Your cooperation in providing data essential to understanding the nature of professional preparation programs for the superintendency in the U.S. is appreciated.

I GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS:

1) Name of Institution______________________________

2) Location of Institution______________________________
(City,State,Zip Code)

3) Type of Institution: ___a) public; ___b) private; ___c)Other (specify)__________

4) Name of President______________________________

5) Name of Dean, College or School of Education______________________________

6) a) Name of Person with Official Responsibility for Graduate Preparation Programs in Educational Administration______________________________
b) His Administrative Title______________________________

7) Please indicate which of the following agencies have accredited your institution and/or your graduate preparation program for educational administrators:

		ACCREDITATION FOR:			
			Programs for Educational Administrators Through the Following:		
(a) Level	(b) Name of Accrediting Agency	(c) The Institution As a Whole	(d) Masters	(e) 2-Year or Specialist	(f) Doctorate
1. State	______________	__Yes__No	__Yes__No	__Yes__No	__Yes__No
2. Regional	______________	__Yes__No	__Yes__No	__Yes__No	__Yes__No
3. National	______________	__Yes__No	__Yes__No	__Yes__No	__Yes__No
4. Others (specify)	______________	__Yes__No	__Yes__No	__Yes__No	__Yes__No

8) Your first term 1969-70 enrollments, based on full-time equivalency, at the main campus:

____a) In the Institution As a Whole
____b) In the Institution's Graduate School or College
____c) In the College of Education
____d) In the Department Preparing Educational Administrators

II PROGRAM DATA:

9) Check graduate program(s) in which those who are preparing for the school superintendency may be enrolled at your institution:

___a) Masters Degree; ___b) 2-Year (Specialist) Graduate Program; ___c) Doctor of Education Degree; ___d) Doctor of Philosophy Degree; ___e) Other (specify)

____

IF YOUR INSTITUTION DOES NOT HAVE A GRADUATE PROGRAM FOR THE PREPARATION OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS (as indicated in Question 9 above) PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE WITHOUT COMPLETING THE REMAINING QUESTIONS.

IF YOUR INSTITUTION DOES HAVE ONE OR MORE GRADUATE PROGRAMS CHECKED IN QUESTION 9, PLEASE COMPLETE THE REMAINDER OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BEFORE RETURNING IT.

---

10) Please check the highest level of graduate preparation offered by your institution for these positions (other than the school superintendency):

	LEVELS OF PREPARATION					
Positions	(1) Master's	(2) Above Master's But Less Than 2-Year	(3) 2-Year	(4) Ed.D.	(5) Ph.D.	(6) Other, Specify
a. Secondary school principal						
b. Elementary school principal						
c. Supervisor of instruction						
d. College administrators and professors						
e. Jr. college administrators						
f.________________						
g.________________						
h.________________						

11) Does your institution offer work for those interested in the superintendency through both the two-year graduate program and the doctorate? a)__No; b)__Yes.

IF YES, then:

c) Is the two-year graduate program considered to be a "terminal" one for the candidate? 1)__No; 2)__Yes, for all students enrolled; 3)__Yes, but a few students may be accepted for work beyond two years.

d) If "NO", is the two-year graduate program essentially the same as the first two years of your doctoral program? Yes___; No___.

e) Can the credits earned by those accepted for the two-year graduate program only be applied later to satisfy the requirements for the doctoral degree? __No; __Yes, but to a limited degree: __Yes, in large degree; __Yes, in full.

f) Check the title of the award given (if any) for the two-year program:

___1) Specialist in Educational Administration
___2) Certificate of Advanced Study
___3) Diploma for Advanced Graduate Study
___4) Administrator's Certificate
___5) Educational Specialist
___6) Professional Administrator's Diploma
___7) Professional Certificate
___8) Diploma in Educational Administration
___9) Other (specify) ____________________

12) Please check disciplines other than education in which advanced graduate work to prepare superintendents is available, recommended, or required:

Field	Available	Recommended	Required	Indicate the Highest Graduate Degree (Master's or Ph.D.) Offered in Each Field at Your Institution
a) Anthropology				
b) Business Administration				
c) Economics				
d) Political Science				
e) Sociology				
f) Statistics				
g) History				
h) Psychology				
i) Computer Technology				
j) Social Psychology				
k) Philosophy				
l) Law				
m) Operations Research				
n) Others (specify)				

13) What do you consider to be the major strengths of your program(s) for those interested in preparation for the school superintendency?

____

____

____

____

____

14) What do you consider to be the major weaknesses of your program(s) for those interested in preparation for the school superintendency?

____

____

____

____

15) Please check in the appropriate spaces the preparation programs for those interested in the school superintendency in which foreign languages, a thesis, written examination, and/or oral examination is optional (opt.) or required (req.).

	Foreign Languages			Thesis			Written Examination			Oral Examination		
	None	Opt.	Req.	None	Opt.	Req.	None	Opt.	Req.	None	Opt.	Req.
a) Master's	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
b) 2-Year Program	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
c) Ed.D.	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____
d) Ph.D.	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____	____

16) Please check in appropriate columns the full-time continuous residence requirements for each degree program in educational administration.

	Master's	2-Year	Ed.D.	Ph.D.
a) Six Weeks	____	____	____	____
b) Eight Weeks	____	____	____	____
c) Ten Weeks	____	____	____	____
d) One Quarter	____	____	____	____
e) One Trimester	____	____	____	____
f) One Semester	____	____	____	____
g) One Academic Year	____	____	____	____
h) Two Academic Years	____	____	____	____
i) None	____	____	____	____
j) ______________	____	____	____	____
k) ______________	____	____	____	____

17) Please check levels of preparation for those interested in the school superintendency for which your institution provides an internship:

	Optional	Required
a) Master's Degree	____	____
b) 2-Year Program	____	____
c) Doctor of Education Degree	____	____
d) Doctor of Philosophy Degree	____	____

18) How many graduate students preparing for the superintendency are enrolled in your internship program during the present term of the 1969-70 year? ____________

19) What program elements (courses or experiences) offered in 1960-61 school year are no longer offered during 1969-70? (Please list elements deleted.)

____

____

____

____

20) What program elements (courses or experiences) offered in 1969-70 were not available in 1960-61? (Please list the new program elements added during the present decade.)

____

____

____

____

21) Which program element changes shown in question 19 or 20 do you feel contributed most significantly to the improvement of your program?

____

____

____

22) Please check any of the following factors which, in your opinion, are major deterrents to improvements in your program(s) for those interested in preparation for the school superintendency:

___ a) Inadequate funds
___ b) Inadequate opportunities for research
___ c) Shortage of high quality staff personnel
___ d) Inadequate opportunities for service in the field
___ e) Lack of close relations with school systems
___ f) Resistance of staff members and/or college officials
___ g) Inadequate offerings in related fields of study
___ h) Shortage of buildings and facilities
___ i) Lack of high quality students
___ j) Lack of adequate secretarial and other supporting staff
___ k) ______________________________
____

23) Is your institution now cooperating with other institutions of higher learning in any interinstitutional projects as part of your preparation program(s) for superintendents?

___a) No; ___b) Yes; if yes, please describe:

24) Does your institution offer inservice education programs for those now in the superintendency? ___a) No; ___b) Yes.

IF YES, then

____a) Number of special conferences for superintendents offered during a given year
____b) Average length in days of such conferences
____c) Average number who attend a given conference
____d) Number of short courses offered for credit in a given year
____e) Length of a short course
____f) Graduate hours of credit offered for a short course
____g) Average number likely to attend a short course
____h) Other inservice experiences or features: (please describe)

25) Please indicate which of the following instructional strategies are employed in your preparation programs for the school superintendency. (Check those that are used.)

____a) Lecture and discussion
____b) Independent study and research
____c) Computer-assisted instruction
____d) Films and film strips
____e) Simulation and gaming
____f) Educational TV
____g) Field visits
____h) Special projects
____i) Case studies
____j) Team teaching
____k) Others (specify)____________

III STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND ADMISSION STANDARDS:

26) Please check admission requirements for graduate students interested in preparing for the school superintendency in appropriate columns:

Requirements	(1) Master's	(2) 2-Year	(3) Ed.D.	(4) Ph.D.
a) Character references				
b) Written recommendations				
c) Completion of certain types of undergraduate courses				
d) Minimum undergraduate grade-point average (specify the minimum and scale used)				
e) Minimum graduate grade-point average (specify minimum and scale)				
f) Standardized tests				
g) Physical examination				
h) Minimum age (specify)				
i) Maximum age (specify)				
j) Oral examination or interview				
k) Teaching experience (specify amount demanded)				
l) Administrative experience (specify amount demanded)				
m) ______				
n) ______				

27) Please list the names of published standardized tests or others used in screening prospective students in administration and indicate in appropriate columns the cut-off scores used (if any):

	CUT-OFF SCORES USED			
(a) Name of Test	(b) Master's	(c) 2-Year	(d) Ed.D.	(e) Ph.D.

28) Please indicate the following characteristics of full-time graduate students in educational administration programs in 1969-70

_____a) Age of youngest full-time enrollee

_____b) Age of oldest full-time enrollee

_____c) Average age of all full-time enrollees in 1969-70

_____d) Percent full-time enrollees who are women

29) How many graduate students were admitted to the graduate educational administration programs in 1969-70?

_____a) At the master's level
_____b) At the postmaster's of 2-year level
_____c) At the doctorate level

30) Please indicate in the appropriate spaces the number of scholarships and fellowships obtained during the 1969-70 school year by graduate students preparing for the school superintendency (aid without service rendered):

Amount	Master's	2-Year	Ed.D.	Ph.D.
a) $8,000 or more				
b) $7,000 to $7,999				
c) $6,000 to $6,999				
d) $5,000 to $5,999				
e) $4,000 to $4,999				
f) $3,000 to $3,999				
g) $2,000 to $2,999				
h) $1,000 to $1,999				
i) Less than $1,000				

31) Please indicate the various sources of funds for graduate student scholarships and fellowships:

____1) Foundations
____2) University endowments or development funds
____3) Scholarships furnished by state legislatures
____4) United States Government grants
____5) Other (specify)____________________

32) Please indicate in the appropriate spaces the number of assistantships (or other positions in which students render services) held during the 1969-70 school year by graduate students preparing for the superintendency:

Amount	(1) Master's	(2) 2-Year	(3) Ed.D.	(4) Ph.D.
a) $5,000 or more				
b) $4,000 to $4,999				
c) $3,000 to $3,999				
d) $2,000 to $2,999				
e) $1,000 to $1,999				
f) Less than $1,000				

33) Please indicate in the appropriate spaces the number of graduate students preparing for the superintendency to whom your institution has made loans during the 1969-70 school year:

Amount	(1) Master's	(2) 2-Year	(3) Ed.D.	(4) Ph.D.
a) $1,000 or more				
b) Less than $1,000				

34) Please indicate in the appropriate spaces the number of graduate students preparing for the superintendency who are receiving financial aid from local districts (such as through a sabbatical) during the 1969-70 school year:

Amount	(1) Master's	(2) 2-Year	(3) Ed.D.	(4) Ph.D.
a) $8,000 or more				
b) $7,000 to $7,999				
c) $6,000 to $6,999				
d) $5,000 to $5,999				
e) $4,000 to $4,999				
f) $3,000 to $3,999				
g) $2,000 to $2,999				
h) $1,000 to $1,999				
i) Less than $1,000				

35) What is the cost (tuition and/or fees) for full-time residence work to graduate students (Mark the category applicable to your institution.)?

Term	(1) In State	(2) Out of State	Term	(1) In State	(2) Out of State
a) Per quarter			c) Per trimester		
b) Per semester			d)		

36) What is the cost (tuition and/or fees) for less than full-time residence work to graduate students (Mark the category applicable to your institution.)?

Term	(1) In State	(2) Out of State	Term	(1) In State	(2) Out of State
a) Per quarter credit hour			c) Per trimester credit hour		
b) Per semester credit hour			d)		

37) How many full-time and part-time students are enrolled during the present term of the 1969-70 school year in your program(s) for educational administration?

	(1) Full-time	(2) Part-time		(1) Full-time	(2) Part-time
a) Master's			c) Doctor of Education		
b) 2-Year Program			d) Doctor of Philosophy		

38) What percent of the above numbered students do you estimate have the superintendency as an objective?______________

39) How many others do you estimate to be in active candidacy (taken work within the last five years)? This includes those attending summer sessions, extension, evening, or week-end courses--all of whom you consider to be in progress toward the master's or a higher degree for superintendents. Please specify number for each level:

_____a) Master's degree
_____b) 2-Year program
_____c) Doctor of Education degree
_____d) Doctor of Philosophy degree

40) How many completed the master's program in educational administration:

_____a) in the 1968-69 year?
_____b) in the 1960-61 year?

41) How many completed the 2-year graduate program in educational administration:

_____a) in the 1968-69 year?
_____b) in the 1960-61 year?
_____c) No such program available

42) How many completed the Ed.D. program in educational administration:

_____a) in the 1968-69 year?
_____b) in the 1960-61 year?
_____c) No such program available

43) How many completed the Ph.D. program in educational administration:

_____a) in the 1968-69 year?
_____b) in the 1960-61 year?
_____c) No such program available

IV FACULTY CHARACTERISTICS:

(Please estimate 1960-61 data which is not available)

44) Please indicate the number of regular university faculty members in educational administration who devote the major portion or full time to teaching, research, and/or service in the area of school administration.

_____a) in 1960-61;
_____b) in 1969-70

45) Please indicate (by number) the highest academic degrees held by regular faculty members who devote a major portion or full time to educational administration programs:

Highest Degree	Number In 1960-61	Number In 1969-70	Highest Degree	Number In 1960-61	Number In 1969-70
a) Baccalaureate			d) Ed.D.		
b) Master's			e) Ph.D.		
c) 2-Year Graduate			f) ____________		

46) Please indicate the total number of faculty members who devote at least part time to teaching, research, and/or service in the area of school administration. Include also those who teach only in summer sessions.

_____a) in 1960-61;
_____b) in 1969-70

47) Highest academic degree held by part-time faculty:

Highest Degree	Number In		Highest Degree	Number In	
	1960-61	1969-70		1960-61	1969-70
a) Baccalaureate	______	______	d) Ed.D.	______	______
b) Master's	______	______	e) Ph.D.	______	______
c) 2-Year Graduate	______	______	f) ____________	______	______

48) What percent of your full-time faculty (devoting a major portion of time) in educational administration have had experience as a public school administrator?

_____a) No administrative experience
_____b) The highest administrative position held was assistant principal
_____c) The highest administrative position held was principal
_____d) The highest administrative position held was assistant superintendent
_____e) The highest administrative position held was superintendent

49) What percent of your part-time faculty in educational administration have had experience as a public school administrator?

_____a) No administrative experience
_____b) Highest administrative position held was principal or assistant principal
_____c) Highest administrative position held was superintendent or assistant superintendent

50) Please indicate the age distribution of faculty members who devote the major portion of full time to educational administration:

_____a) Age of youngest faculty member
_____b) Age of oldest faculty member
_____c) Average age of full-time faculty members in educational administration
_____d) Age distribution:
    _____(1) Under 30
    _____(2) 30 - 39
    _____(3) 40 - 49
    _____(4) 50 - 59
    _____(5) 60 and over

51) Please indicate the 1969-70 salary distribution of full-time faculty members (devoting a major portion of time) to educational administration:

_____a) Lowest 12-month salary to be paid in 1969-70 to any faculty member
_____b) Highest 12-month salary to be paid in 1969-70 to any faculty member
_____c) Average 12-month salary to be paid in 1969-70 to all faculty members
_____d) Salary distribution for the 12-month period (indicate number of faculty at each level):

    _____(1) Under $10,000
    _____(2) $10,000 - $14,999
    _____(3) $15,000 - $19,999
    _____(4) $20,000 - $24,999
    _____(5) $25,000 - $29,999
    _____(6) $30,000 and over

52) Please indicate the professorial rank distribution of full-time faculty members (devoting the major portion of time) to educational administration (Indicate number of faculty at each rank.):

_____a) Instructor
_____b) Assistant Professor
_____c) Associate Professor
_____d) Full Professor
_____e) Distinguished Professor

53) Please indicate the distribution by tenure of full-time faculty members (devoting a major portion of time) to educational administration in your institution (Count the present year as one and specify number at each level.):

_____a) One year of experience
_____b) Two years of experience
_____c) Three years of experience
_____d) Four years of experience
_____e) Five to nine years of experience
_____f) Ten to fourteen years of experience
_____g) Fifteen or more years of experience

54) Please indicate the distribution by sex of full-time faculty members (devoting a major portion of time) to educational administration:

_____a) Number male
_____b) Number female

55) Please indicate the specialization of full-time faculty members (devoting a major portion of time) to educational administration. Please list fields of specializations present and number in each field:

No.	Field of Specialization	No.	Field of Specialization
_____a)	____________________	_____e)	____________________
_____b)	____________________	_____f)	____________________
_____c)	____________________	_____g)	____________________
_____d)	____________________	_____h)	____________________

V RESOURCES AVAILABLE:

56) a) What number of secretaries are available to serve the professors in educational administration?__________

b) This is equivalent to one full-time secretary serving _____professors.

57) Does each professor in educational administration have a separate office?

_____a) Yes; _____b) No. If No is checked, then:

_____c) How many professors are placed in one office?

58) a) How much travel money is allocated by your university to travel for professors in educational administration?__________
b) This is equivalent to __________ dollars per year per professor in educational administration.
c) How much additional travel money comes from special projects to supplement the University travel funds?__________

VI ISSUES FACING THE SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENCY:

59) Please rank each of the following issues and challenges facing the school superintendency using the following scale:

a) Of great significance
b) Significant
c) Of limited significance
d) Little or no significance

Place a check in the blank spaces provided (a,b,c,and d) to indicate the degree of significance you would attach to each of the following issues:

Great a.	Significant b.	Limited c.	Little Or No d.	
____	____	____	____	(1) Social-cultural issues such as race relations, integration, or segregation
____	____	____	____	(2) Issues in school staff relations such as negotiations, strikes, sanctions or some form of teacher militancy
____	____	____	____	(3) Student unrest or activism such as underground newspaper and student strikes
____	____	____	____	(4) Decentralization of large districts into smaller units of administration
____	____	____	____	(5) Reorganization of small districts into larger units of administration
____	____	____	____	(6) Changing priorities in curriculum such as introducing black studies courses or sex education or eliminating others
____	____	____	____	(7) Innovations or demands for new ways of teaching or operating the educational program
____	____	____	____	(8) Financing schools to meet increasing current expenditures and capital outlays
____	____	____	____	(9) Assessing educational outcomes such as the national assessment effort
____	____	____	____	(10) Growing pressure for public support of non-public schools
____	____	____	____	(11) Growing federal involvement in education
____	____	____	____	(12) Caliber of persons assigned to or removed from local boards of education
____	____	____	____	(13) Caliber of responsibilities assigned to or removed from local boards of education
____	____	____	____	(14) Rapidly increasing student-enrollments
____	____	____	____	(15) Greater visibility of the superintendent
____	____	____	____	(16) Increasing attacks on the superintendent
____	____	____	____	(17) Use of drugs in the schools
____	____	____	____	(18) Changes in values and behavioral norms
____	____	____	____	(19) Other (specify)____________________
____	____	____	____	(20) Other (specify)____________________

60) Please indicate which of the following issues (repeated from No.59):
a) should be included within courses or experiences offered; b) which issues are covered adequately; and c) which issues are neglected or not included in your institution's graduate preparation programs for school superintendents.

Place a check in the blank spaces provided (a,b,and c) to indicate:

a) Issues which should be included
b) Issues which are included now and covered adequately
c) Issues which are neglected now or not included in your preparation programs for school superintendents

Should Be Included a.	Included And Covered b.	Neglected c.	
			(1) Social-cultural issues such as race relations, integration, or segregation
			(2) Issues in school staff relations such as negotiations, strikes, sanctions or some form of teacher militancy
			(3) Student unrest or activism such as underground newspaper and student strikes
			(4) Decentralization of large districts into smaller units of administration
			(5) Reorganization of small districts into larger units of administration
			(6) Changing priorities in curriculum such as introducing black studies courses or sex education or eliminating others
			(7) Innovations or demands for new ways of teaching or operating the educational program
			(8) Financing schools to meet increasing current expenditures and capital outlays
			(9) Assessing educational outcomes such as the national assessment effort
			(10) Growing pressure for public support of non-public schools
			(11) Growing federal involvement in education
			(12) Caliber of persons assigned to or removed from local boards of education
			(13) Caliber of responsibilities assigned to or removed from local boards of education
			(14) Rapidly increasing student-enrollments
			(15) Greater visibility of the superintendent
			(16) Increasing attacks on the superintendent
			(17) Use of drugs in the schools
			(18) Changes in values and behavioral norms
			(19) Other (specify)____________________
			(20) Other (specify)____________________

Date________________ Signed________________________ Position____________________

AASA and this special AASA Commission expresses appreciation to you for completion and return of this instrument.

SEND TO: AASA, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036